DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 366 522 SO 023 551

AUTHOR	Williams, Lisa J.
TITLE	Why Some People Just Can't Speak Up: Gender Bias in the Classroom.
PUB DATE	93
NOTE	156p.; Master's Thesis, School for International Training.
PUB TYPE	Dissertations/Theses - Masters Theses (042)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Classroom Environment; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Family Role; Females; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Nature Nurture Controversy; Sex; *Sex Bias; *Sex Discrimination; *Sex Role; *Sex Stereotypes; *Student Participation; *Teacher Expectations of Students; Womens Education; Womens Studies
IDENTIFIERS	Cuba; Vermont

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the issue of gender bias in education. Major components of the thesis include research in Vermont schools and secondary sources including the 1992 American Association of University Women report. The paper includes three main divisions. The first part addresses the paradox of trying to study gender, including some basic theories on what gender is and how it is developed. The second part looks at school and its role in promoting gender differences. The final section offers resources and suggestions for change. The major finding is that the educational system socializes the sexes into specific roles based on tradition, bias, and the widespread desire to maintain the status quo. Due to the contrast between traditional feminine roles and the behaviors necessary for educational excellence, females often suffer in coeducational settings. Specific areas covered include the following: (1) an explication of research that strongly supports the conclusion that nurture rather than nature produces differences between the sexes; (2) a discussion of the family and peers' roles in gender socialization; (3) a historical overview of the education of women; (4) a case study of Cuba showing how schools are used in the intentional socialization of gender roles; (5) a focus on educators' attention, students' participation, and expectations of both; (6) a look at how the curriculum often discourages females from realizing their potential; and (7) various suggestions to make the educational system a more equitable one. Contains 45 references. (Author/DK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 366 522

WHY SOME PEOPLE CAN'T JUST SPEAK UP:

GENDER BIAS IN THE CLASSROOM

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Lisa J. Williams

B.A. Smith College--1990

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
LISA J. WILLIAMS
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts in Teaching Degree at the School for International Training, Brattleboro, Vermont.
March, 1993.

Copyright 1993

SO 023 551

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This project by Lisa J. Williams is accepted in its present form.

Date March 17, 1993

Project Advisor

Project Reader Phyllis Nahman

Abstract:

This paper examines the often-ignored issue of gender bias in education. Major components of the thesis include the author's research in Vermont schools and a wide variety of secondary sources, especially the 1992 AAUW report. The major finding is that the educational system socializes the sexes into specific roles based on tradition, bias, and the widespread desire to maintain the status quo. Due to the contrast between traditional feminine roles and the behaviors necessary for educational excellence, females often suffer in coeducational settings. Specific areas covered include the following: 1) An explication of research which strongly supports the conclusion that nurture rather than nature produces differences between the sexes. 2) A discussion of the family and peers' roles in gender socialization. 3) An historical overview of the education of women. 4) A case study of Cuba showing how schools are used in the intentional socialization of gender roles. 5) A focus on educators' attention, students' participation, and expectations of both. Many of the findings in these three areas result from the author's research. 6) A look at how the curriculum often discourages females from realizing their potential; and an examination of the current debate on the issue of curriculum change. And finally, 7) various suggestions to make the educational system a more equitable one.

ERIC DESCRIPTORS

teacher expectations of students

sex bias

sex discrimination

sex role

sex stereotypes

women's education

women's studies

Acknowledgments:

One of the warmest memories of my work on this project is of the vast number of people, both previous acquaintances and new who so warmly and graciously offered their assistance. For reasons of space and to protect anonymity I will not name them. However, over 180 students and educators (elementary through graduate level) gave me their help. Thanks to all teachers who allowed me into their classrooms, and gave me their time. Special thanks to all the students who responded openly and thoughtfully to my probing . Those who I would like to name include: Phyllis Nahman of Greenfield Community College. As my teacher, a number of years ago, she inspired confidence in my academic capabilities. As a reader for this project she offered the perfect amount of support and assistance. Paul Levasseur, my advisor, did a commendable job of piling through too many pages of what at times must have seemed to be quite an unfamiliar topic. Phyllis Benay and Ira Rubenzahl aided me in the interpretation of my data which, after collecting, I had no idea what to do with. Ed Morgan introduced me to computer pie charts which proved to be crucial. Big thanks to Mary and Gregory who went above and beyond the standard roles as friends. Mary for her physical and spiritual company in the lab day after day, throughout the initial three-quarters of this paper, her soup and tea were also of utmost importance. And Gregory who flew thousands of miles to help with what he thought to be a few days of final editing and ended up working on the paper and shoveling snow for a month. Finally, special thanks to Eileen Chalfoun for providing me with a "room of my own" which enabled me to see this project through.

This paper is dedicated to a very special MAT class. I hope this helps to answer some of our questions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT and ERIC DESCRIPTORS iii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iv

INTRODUCTION 1

PART ONE

AN INTRODUCTION TO SOME OF THE ISSUES IN GENDER STUDIES

CHAPTER 1 6

1-1 The Paradox 6
1-2 Sex Vs. Gender 9
1-3 Nature 11
1-4 Nurture: The Socialization of Gender 13

CHAPTER 2 THE SOCIALIZATION OF GENDER; WHO'S DOING IT?

2-1 Role of the Family in Socialization 16
2-2 Peers 18

PART TWO
SCHOOL: WHAT'S HAPPENING IN IT?

CHAPTER 3 SCHOOL FOR WOMEN? 23

CHAPTER 4 THE ROLE OF THE SCHOOL IN THE SOCIALIZATION OF GENDER 27

4-1 Cuba: One Case for School as Role Socializer 29
4-2 US Politics in Education 32

CHAPTER 5 RESEARCH TODAY

5-1 Re-Examining the Chilly Climate, and the AAUW Report 38
5-2 The Author's Research 42

CHAPTER 6 INTO THE CLASSROOM: BIASES IN EXPECTATIONS

6-1 Teacher Expectations 44
6-2 Student and Teacher Expectations in the Author's Research 49

CHAPTER 7 ATTENTION

7-1 Who Gets it and What Kind 58
7-2 The Author's Research on Attention 64
7-3 The Benefits of "Acting Up" 67

CHAPTER 8 WHO'S PARTICIPATING? 72

CHAPTER 9 SOME POSSIBLE CONSEQUENCES OF BIAS IN THE CLASSROOM 82

CHAPTER 10 BIAS IN THE CURRICULUM

10-1 What is Taught? What Changes Have Occurred? 89
10-2 But There Weren't Any Women in Those Fields 101
10-3 The Battle Over The Curriculum 104

PART THREE
SOME IDEAS FOR CHANGE

CHAPTER 11 GIRLS' SCHOOLS, WOMEN'S COLLEGES 113

CHAPTER 12 TEACHER TRAINING 120

CHAPTER 13 SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR PROMOTING SEX EQUITY IN THE CLASSROOM 131

CHAPTER 14 CONCLUSIONS 136

Appendix A 139

Appendix B 142

Works Cited 144

INTRODUCTION

" There is nothing more basic than equal opportunity for all your students"
(M. Sadker and D Sadker 1982, 137).

"Well, if you wanted to say something, why didn't you just speak up?" This is a often a popular response when women bring to attention that men seem to ask more questions, get involved in more active participation, and speak more in general, in a classroom setting. Why do some women just not speak up? This question repeatedly arose in my Masters of Arts in Teaching (MAT) program. Recognizing it as an important question but not being able to answer it was one reason for my study of this topic. As future educators it is crucial that we become aware of, and understand why these patterns of participation occur, what their effects are on students, and how change is best implemented.

My motivation for this paper is both personal and professional. My diverse educational background--from a predominantly male technical high school to private women's college to co-educational graduate school--has sensitized me to the role of gender in the classroom. Although I had originally wanted to inject many of my own experiences into this paper, adding these to all the issues I wanted to cover became an impossible task. What I would like to acknowledge is that my findings in the research are very consistent with my experience in each of these different types of institutions.

In brief, my own experience as a student has been one of constant change--from a respected, motivated, elementary school student, to an uninterested, trouble-making high school student, to a high achieving college student, and to a more passive, less confident graduate student. Having been the same person throughout these experiences, I am intensely interested in what other factors affected my school behavior, causing me to thrive or wither.

My undergraduate minor in women's studies also motivated me to pursue this topic. The lack of educational materials which focus on women and girls encouraged me to make a contribution.

The final signal that told me I had to address the topic of gender occurred when I became aware that as a teacher I was paying more attention to the males in my classes than to the females. That I, someone deeply aware of and educated in gender studies, could possibly be falling into this same typical pattern, thoroughly convinced me that all teachers, myself included, need to be educated in the research on gender before going into the classroom. Making oneself aware of the amount of "gendered baggage" with which students and teachers walk into the classroom is a very important step in letting students out of the cage which inhibits all people from reaching their full potential.

This paper will include three main divisions. The first part will address the paradox of trying to study gender, including some basic theories on what gender is and how it is developed. The second part will look at school and its role in promoting gender differences. We will move into the classroom looking at past and current research to see where sex-biases come into play and what the consequences are of this differential treatment. Part of the research looked at is my own surveys and observations of 129 students and 13 teachers in the Brattleboro, Vermont area. The final section will offer resources and suggestions for change.

Because my intent is to make teachers aware of the overall picture of gender studies, I will be addressing many issues in brief as opposed to going into great depth on a few. As a result, generalization will be necessary. I feel this is the best way to give those with little background an overall perspective on the situation. It is my hope that readers will continue their own education through the bibliography of this paper.

I would like to state some of my own views on feminism because this paper contradicts some basic theories. I was educated to be aware that much writing and scholarship which has been done on women only talks about women who are white and middle or upper class. Excluded are women of different socioeconomic and ethnic backgrounds. The word "women" does not stand for all women. The sexism which Black, Latina, and Asian women endure is compounded by racism, making the struggle an even more vicious and complex one.

Because this ideology is a step beyond what were once known as the issues of gender studies, a lot of the research in these areas does not reflect this current thinking. Throughout this paper I have made an effort to include the latest research. However, due to both the scarcity of research which reflects ethnic diversity, and, for my study, the homogeneity of Vermont, this paper is similarly biased. I did use diverse examples when they were available. It is my hope, however, that in making readers aware of the biases which have been found between the treatment of mainly white boys and white girls, readers will gain an overall sensitivity to biases of all types in the classroom. If there is strong bias between white females and white males in school, then the situation can only get bleaker when racism becomes combined with sexism.

Being locked into gender roles has a negative effect on males as well as females. However, because women's roles usually entail less power and less access to power, it seems more crucial at this moment to focus on how schools help perpetuate this situation for women, and how we as educators can change that. When examining gender biases, negative biases towards boys and men will also surface. It should be understood that in freeing females from their set roles, males will consequently have the reins on their worlds loosened, allowing greater access for all people to reach their personal potential.

> If schools are really aiming to promote social justice, human rights, respect and understanding of others; if they are valuing differences and helping to develop democratic, socially, economically and politically aware citizens, then issues relating to race and gender need to be addressed in all schools. (Pearse 1989, 273)

PART ONE

AN INTRODUCTION TO SOME OF THE ISSUES IN GENDER STUDIES

CHAPTER 1

1-1: THE PARADOX

> Because the way we often treat people is still gender-based, we must work to build a positive female identity, while at the same time working on the long-term goal of building institutions and processes that treat people as humans (not as members of a sex, race or other group). It is a paradox common to transition periods and one we need to accept as unavoidable in the short term. (The University of the State of New York 1989, 2)

Talking about gender differences can be risky business. When we begin the dialogue of speaking of females as different and separate from males, we open doors for discrimination. We run the risk that those differences will be looked at as innate and used against females. If men and women want to be treated the same, it is often said, just put them together and ignore the differences. As one female MAT student responded in the survey given, "The more people push gender issues the more separated we become. Equality comes through unity not division." If we just make schools co-ed and treat everyone the same, give them the same classes, the same schedule, the same lunch, is it not that simple? Do we not create differences in thinking about them?

Ideally, we should not have to address groups individually by sex or race. However, if we are going to treat everyone the same once they are in school, we need to be fairly confident that students have had the same types of experiences, and have been socialized in relatively like ways prior to their arrival. We then need to be certain that once in school, what passes as equal treatment actually is. We have not yet arrived at this point.

A basic tenet of ethnic studies is the acknowledgement of differences. One cannot negate the differentiating factors which have acted upon lives, and which make people uniquely different due to sex, color, gender, etc. To lump different groups together, particularly groups which have suffered forms of oppression, is doing a tremendous disservice to those groups. Because two people are standing in the same place does not mean they have arrived on the same road; some roads are much straighter and smoother than others. This must always be taken into consideration. To progress from our current state to where we can one day look at men and women as equal we have to now begin doing two things at once.

> On the one hand, we are trying to minimize unnecessary male/female differentiation because it so often undermines self-esteem. On the other hand, we are trying to undo the damage done to female identity by providing a positive sense of what it means to be female and by affirming the value of womanhood. (The University of the State of New York 1989, 2)

This paradox causes confusion for many. Pearce and Rossi (1984) state well this dilemma of feminism.

> Feminists simultaneously demand increased consciousness of gender (in order to sensitize persons to discrimination) and an absence of gender consciousness (as the prescription for a better system . . .) (cited in Warren 1988, 18)

Warren says this situation causes confusion, particularly for men, as they receive what appear to be conflicting messages and so become unsure of what to say and how to act. She finds it useful to think about this dilemma in the following way:

> If we understand that consciousness of gender is a way to address women's exclusion and a transcendence of gender categories is a way to correct omission then the problem seems to be the capacity

> to recognize these different imperatives without constructing an opposition between them. (18)

The American Association of University Women (AAUW) agrees that there is a particular danger in looking at both sexes generically as students or youth. They feel that this integration promotes the invisibility of female students and the particular problems which they may face, "compromising the education of our nation's students" (AAUW 1992a, 2).

Many people get their first initiation into gender studies with such popular authors as Deborah Tannen or Carol Gilligan. In their writings, these authors view men and women as different creatures. Their books have immediate impact because people read and then think to themselves, "Ah yes. That's how it works; that is what happens in my house." Gilligan's In a Different Voice (1982) presents the theory that men and women think differently and have different moral development, and therefore have very different needs. Tannan, in her work, comically shows us the communication gap in male and female speech patterns. These are situations to which many can easily relate.

The problem with this way of thinking, what can be called the "essential female" or "essential male" ideology, is that it often does not include discussion of the factors which created the differences in the first place. Readers are at risk of reaching the conclusion of "that's just how men (or women) are, so how can we deal with these inevitable problems?" Trying to change communication styles after they have been learned is akin to diagnostic medicine as opposed to preventative. Although males and females do ultimately seem to have different needs in the classroom, and yes, males and females often do communicate in different ways, it is often and rightly demanded that greater emphasis be placed on why and how these different needs and ways of expressing themselves are created, and how we can break or expand the molds which shape these patterns. For only after recognizing the forces which create and shape differences, is it then possible to move onto the ultimate goal of treating all people as equals not as a sex, gender, or race. But first what are sex and gender? And why the distinction?

1-2: SEX VS. GENDER

When we talk about the sex of a person we are speaking of the biological differences between men and women. Gender, however, is not the same. Gender refers to the predispositions about masculine and feminine roles (Pearson 1987, 3). Most people are familiar with these roles as they are manifested in the U.S.; the strong, dominant, analytical, decisive male,versus the weaker, more passive, emotional, and indecisive female.

Gender and sex are related, as the masculine traits are more likely to be owned by men and vice versa, however; "they are not identical constructs" (4).

> Changes in social groupings encourages the consideration of 'sex' and 'gender' as separate constructs. No one can assume that women are 'feminine' and men are 'masculine'. In some instances just the opposite is the case. (7)

Furthermore, many people fall somewhere in the middle, possessing both masculine and feminine traits. In looking at sex and gender from now on we should be clear that the two are very different, sex being unchangeable, but gender being a set of behaviors which are determined by a culture.

That gender roles are not set can be observed in a study by Kaschak and Sharrat (1985). This study looked at the inconsistency of gender and how gender is influenced by context. While it should be noted that the study was done on Latin American students, it still is relevant to U.S. students, as it will enable one to see the mutability of gender.

Kaschak and Sharrat's research was conducted on fifty males and fifty females from three social classes. A Spanish language instrument for measuring gender roles and personality was used. Students were asked to imagine themselves in different situations. In each situation they were to imagine themselves once with a male friend, once with a female friend, and then with one of both. Their reactions in each of the situations were monitored.

It was found that males played out more feminine behaviors in the presence of women, and less feminine behaviors in the presence of men. As for masculine traits in men, men showed more of them with male friends and fewer with female friends. Women's overall scores were consistently more androgynous, that is, displaying both role behaviors. Women's masculine behaviors stayed consistent in all situations. However, in the presence of males, women's feminine behaviors did increase. "The findings suggest that the presence of a male calls forth gender role stereotyped behavior in both females and males" (Kaschak and Sharrat 1985, abstract).

> While males scored much lower in femininity when with another male and in the mixed situation, females were able to behave in both masculine and feminine manners in all three situations. These results suggest that the presence of a male does indeed call forth gender role stereotyped behavior in both females and males and that in addition, the presence of males alone or in a mixed situation limits female attributions for men. This interesting result is in keeping with the notion that traditionally masculine behaviors are more acceptable for women than are traditional feminine ones for men (10).

The authors cite another example of gender role flexibility. Dindia, et al (1986), found that women were more likely to act submissive with males they are not married to, but when with their spouses, they were found to act in a dominant fashion.

1-3: NATURE

In the above chapter we saw how gender roles are flexible and not set. The majority of the research on gender today views roles in this way.

> However investigations of how humans differ by sex dominated the literature on women in education throughout the 1970's . . . they hoped to establish clear - cut biological imperatives of the superiority of one sex over the other. (Goetz and Grant 1988, 184)

Goetz and Grant and many others feel that this type of work has "run its course. . . .What we have learned from the early period of research studies conducted through the 1970's is that individual differences between the sexes are predominantly learned characteristics" (184).

In brief, work that is still being done in the biological vein can be seen in Languis and Naour's (1985), "Sex Differences and Neurodevelopmental Variables: A Vector Model". Their work differs from that of the seventies as they view individuals as falling along a continuum of feminine to masculine behaviors, leaving no individual completely male or female. Where a person falls on this scale is due to differences in hormonal levels in utero, hormones such as estrogen, testosterone and most importantly, androgens. Their "hypothesis suggests that the variability in levels of circulating androgens during utero development results in a behavioral continuum upon which males and females might be placed" (8). They list the following as the most popular female/male behavioral dichotomy: Female--Accommodating, Social, Verbal, and Compliant; Male--Aggressive, Exploratory, Visual Spatial, and Dominant. (8)

As Languis and Naour report on their findings, "the significance of these data is that in utero levels of circulating androgens have tremendous impact on the developing fetus, resulting in behavioral variability" (7). Hormonal differences are thought also to contribute to different brain lateralization for males and females which , in turn, is said to attribute to distinct intellectual abilities in such areas as math and language. However, Languis and Naour temper this line of thinking in their study, saying that

> Caution is necessary in drawing conclusions that the development of lateralization for language is one way for females and another for males. Although there is a more defined pattern for each sex, a continuum of development patterns may be appropriate, . . . the extremes of the continuum would be females on one end and males on the other, but the bulk of females and males may fall within a shared region. (9)

This modern research appears to come closer to what the behaviorists are presently saying. For example, Goetz and Grant state that,"the research indicates only a few, small genetic differences between males and females, beyond those associated with procreation" (183). They feel the only evidence for the nature model may be seen in aggression and visual/spatial ability, though "both of these attributes are so enmeshed in environmental and cultural influences that they eventually may be demonstrated to be learned" (183).

1-4: NURTURE

THE SOCIALIZATION OF GENDER

> The varied sex-role associations given to men and women in different cultures suggest that the basic characteristics of men and women are not biologically determined; rather they are based on cultural definitions of sex-appropriate behavior. (Weitzman 1984, 158)

When looking at the construction of gender as something formed by culture, it is useful to look cross-culturally to see how gender roles are the same or different between groups. For this reason, anthropological work can be particularly helpful. "Anthropologists who have examined sex roles cross-culturally have found great diversity in the roles assumed 'natural' for men and women and in the extent of differentiation between the sexes" (157).

Anthropologist Margaret Mead, in her studies of male and female roles in New Guinea found great diversity in the roles assigned to the sexes. She found both sexes in the Arapesh tribe to be, in general, mild and responsive, while she observed the Mundugumor as being violent and aggressive as a whole. In the Tchambuli, she observed what she felt was the reversal of Western sex roles; she saw Tchambuli men as being dependent while the women were dominant, impersonal, and more managing (Mead 1935 cited in Weitzman). If we were to combine the nature model of socialization, with anthropological work such as the above,

> We ought then to conclude that Tchambuli men are more dependent because they have more female hormones. This would be akin to concluding that Latin American men are more macho

> than American men because of higher levels of male hormones, or that Oriental women are less aggressive than American women because they have more female hormones. (Weitzman 1984, 159)

When the nature model is viewed in this sense, it borders on the ridiculous.

Weitzman addresses another dynamic example to back the case of sex roles as socialized behavior, this time using hermaphrodites (people born with both male and female organs, or with external male and internal female organs and vise versa). In the case of hermaphrodites, gender is assigned in one direction or the other at birth. Weitzman states that when babies are originally assigned to one sex but later found to belong " biologically (genetically, gonally, hormonally) to the opposite sex . . . in virtually all these cases, the sex assignment, and thus rearing proved dominant" (159).

Just as certain foods, clothing and religions are specific to cultures, so too are gender-role behaviors. With gender norms as with other cultural norms, adherence is rewarded, while divergence can have a variety of consequences ranging from puzzlement and raised eyebrows, to punishment, prison, and death. There is little wonder then, why the "self will tend toward the behaviors encouraged by others and will tend to stay away from the behaviors discouraged by others" (Pearson 1987, 3).

Pearson states that "from the time of birth people are treated differently because of their genitalia" (3). When one enters the world bearing innate genitalia, a ready made list is already theirs for which behaviors they should build on and which should be quickly forgotten. This can most clearly be seen when males and females display the same behaviors and receive opposing reactions to those behaviors; "for instance, a businesswoman might be labeled 'aggressive, pushy and argumentative,' but her male counterpart may be viewed as 'ambitious, assertive, and independent' " (5).

Not only are behaviors labeled differently according to which sex is displaying them, but "countless studies have demonstrated that when men and women were engaged in identical behavior, the behavior was devalued for women" (5). Pearson goes on to cite a classic study by Goldberg (1968) in which people are given identical essays to read. This identical essay is then attributed to either a male or female author. "The essay was given a higher grade when respondents believed it to be written by a male" (5), and a lower grade when the author was said to be female.

To end this discussion of the general socialization of gender, and before moving into the variety of specific influencing factors which continue to make sure the play is being performed by the appropriate characters, this final thought is a good summary of the creation of the gender-role:

> Consequently, socialization must be understood as two very different but equally anxiety producing processes for boys and girls because it requires them both to conform to rigid sex-role standards that are often in conflict with their individual temperaments or preferences. To the extent that we continue to define appropriate sex-role behaviors for men and women as polar opposites, we will continue to push individuals into unnatural molds. (Weitzman 1984, 172)

CHAPTER 2

THE SOCIALIZATION OF GENDER; WHO'S DOING IT ?

> From the minute a newborn baby girl is wrapped in a pink blanket and her brother in a blue one, the two children are treated differently. The difference starts with the subtle tones of voice adults use in cooing over the two cradles, and it continues with the father's mock wrestling with his baby boy and gentler play with his 'fragile' daughter. (Weitzman 1984, 160 from ideas of Komanorsky 1953)

2-1: ROLE OF THE FAMILY IN SOCIALIZATION

Studies suggest that parents treat babies differently according to their sex from day one. Weitzman cites a 1967 study in which " Howard Moss observed mothers' treatment of their newborn child at three weeks and three months, and he found the infants were being given consistent reinforcement for sex-appropriate behavior" (Weitzman 1984, 161). Bell and Carver (1980) observed that male and female babies were not only dressed in different colors, but that parents responded to their babies differently depending on the sex of the child (cited in Pearson 1987, 3). Condry and Condry (1976) found that parents used different adjectives in describing their male and female babies. Boys were referred to as, "strong, solid and independent, but girls as loving, cute and sweet" (cited in Pearson 1987, 3). Jerrie Will et al. (1974) also found differential treatment of babies in her study of peoples' responses to six month olds. When the subjects thought the child was male, they offered "him" a train. But women offerred a doll to what they considered to be a girl (cited in Weitzman 1984, 160). "In addition, the mothers who thought the child was a girl commented that, 'she was a real girl', they said 'she was sweeter and cried more softly than a boy would.' (In fact, the child was a boy)" (160). And as with the studies of adults, when people viewed the exact same behaviors performed by infants and then described the behavior the descriptions were different depending on whether the observers were told the infant was a "boy" or a "girl" (Pearson 4).

The pattern continues outside of the cradle:

> Children tend to develop self-concepts based on the sexual divisions which they observe around them. Even in families which attempt to treat boys and girls equally can not avoid sex-role typing when the male parent is tangentially involved in household labor and child rearing. (Gintis and Bowles 1976, 143)

The amount of gender-specific material to which children are exposed is endless; cartoons, story books, toys, etc. are all laden with gender information. It takes a very strong effort on the parents' part to counteract these myriad images. From what types of games children play to how they are treated when they hurt themselves in those games all contribute to making the girl more passive and quiet and the boy rowdier, tougher, dirtier. Most parents consciously or unconsciously develop in their children those very attributes that Languis and Naour listed for typical male and female behaviors.

The family sex-role socialization pattern is found to be a different one for black girls. Black girls are more likely to see a strong mother figure in the home, and unlike white girls, a lack of well-paying jobs for their men (Weitzman 1984, 180). Weitzman says that black mothers "realize they can not rely on men for support and they socialize their daughters to have the same realistic skepticism" (180). This pattern predominated in the lower classes. As Weitzman states so clearly, black girls know that Snow White is white and that there will be no Prince Charming (180). That black girls seem to be socialized to be somewhat more independent and strong may be one of the factors that determine why black girls' self-esteem does not drop so rapidly in high school as it does for white girls. The issue of self-esteem will be looked at in Chapter 9.

The role of the family may be one of the most important in developing gender-roles as we will see in Chapter 4 in a study of Castro's Cuba. There it is thought to be the family which is keeping traditional roles in place against strong efforts to change those roles. But family is, of course, not the only factor in the development of the "appropriate" gender behaviors.

2-2: PEERS

> Peer networks often are more supportive of traditional gender arrangements than are school personal (Best 1983, Hudson 1984), and peer resistance can undermine programs to enhance gender equity in schools. (Guttentag and Bray 1976 in Goetz and Grant 1988, 187)

Along with teachers and curriculum (to be discussed later), more and more research is now finding that peer groups also play a major part in the development of gender-roles.

> Notable in recent works has been a movement away from concentration of teachers and curriculum alone. Students, even very young ones, are proactive contributors to gender climates in schools (Clarricoates 1978, Grant 1985, Thorne 1985), in extra curricular activities (Elder 1985), and beyond school (Fine 1987). Peer interchanges in and out of school can reinforce or contradict messages about gender emanating from the official curriculum (Goetz & Grant 1988, 187).

Eisenhart and Holland (1983) write that "the peer group is a major, if not the primary, medium for the transmission of gender" (330). Maltz and Borker (1978) found that children not only learn to segregate by gender, but they also are learning different "values and norms for friendly interactions in these groups. Thus, adult patterns of cross-gender conversation in 'friendly exchanges' are riddled by miscommunication" (Eisenhart and Holland 1983, 329).

These patterns which children are displaying are thought to "reinforce the organizational patterns of the institutions in which children come together" (Sieber (1979) cited in Eisenhart and Holland 322). However, as we will see in the following, they actually found that children were extremely aware of sex differences and grouped themselves accordingly, regardless of teacher attempts to eliminate these behaviors. Goetz and Grant (1988) feel that this gap between educators' promptings and students' actions results from students who reflect those patterns "operating in larger society" (187).

Gender was found to be the most important aspect in predicting children's seating positions in the cafeteria above all other factors including race, social class, etc. (Eisenhart and Holland 1983). Gender was also found to be extremely important in choosing work partners. Though gender is often a major factor in the organization of the classroom in elementary school regarding who does what jobs, plays which sports, etc., Eisenhart and Holland feel that in the specific school they looked at, teachers "did not encourage gender specific activities"

(323). What they discovered at this school was that "in contrast and sometimes in overt opposition to the teachers' emphasis on the children as students, the children's peer groups ignored student identities and instead stressed gender and age identities" (322). Children were said to have focused on topics and activities thought of as extracurricular, thereby promoting an "underground counterculture that was contrary to what was encouraged by school adults" (322).

The children segregated their activities, and once segregated, were very concerned with gender identities and relationships, romantic and sometimes sexual. "Where cross-gendered contact occurred, the interaction was usually interpreted by peers in romantic terms only" (329). Males and females made up two different worlds. Eisenhart and Holland found this to be especially true by the sixth grade where a good portion of talk was concerned with boys, and girls' romantic relationships with them. Topics from what to wear on a date to how to steal another's boy friend comprised the conversations. Two sixth grade girls were heard in conversation, one telling the other, "the way to catch a boy was to let him think you are shy. The friend pointed out that all the girls who had steady boyfriends were shy at school" (327). It is important to think again here about the natural desire of humans to do what is best accepted and rewarded, and how one's behavior is developed by these forces, regardless of what is truer to one's own nature.

As in gender socialization encouraged by the family, a difference was again seen between black girls and white girls in the gender specific expectations placed on them by peers. White girls were expected by friends to be " 'nice', 'cute', 'sweet' and 'popular." Positive remarks referred to a girl who did not act stuck up, over-evaluate her assets, or flaunt her attractive features in front of her friends" (327). Black girls, however, rated a female classmate positively when she demonstrated the "ability to stand up for herself" and when she "assisted others when they were having difficulty or were in trouble" (327).

The above have shown the influence of family and peers in the continuation of gender stereotypes. This does not mean, however, that schools and teachers can be excluded from the gender socialization process. For while "the school may not actively promote gender foci of the peer groups, they certainly provide a rich environment of benign neglect in which such peer groups flourish" (Eisenhart and Holland 1983, 330).

Schools and teachers do play a major role in how children come to see themselves, their self worth, their place in society, and their place in the world. The AAUW found that among school children, "pride in their performance in school and a sense of a secure place in their families do more to determine their self images than feeling of acceptance by their peers" (AAUW 1992b, 10). How schools and teachers help to keep current gender roles in place, what effect these roles have on academic success, and why these roles would be so rigidly perpetuated in the first place, will be the issues addressed in the following section.

PART TWO

SCHOOL: WHAT'S HAPPENING IN IT ?

> A potential modern-day Maria Mitchell may still be deflected from becoming an astronomer by a seventh grade teacher who presents mathematics as inappropriate for a girl, or a Ph.D. thesis advisor who encourages her to lower her sights. The so-called co-educational schools and universities are still likely to have men in almost all the senior posts in teaching and administration. The classroom climate is still, as a thoughtful recent study shows, a "chilly one" for women. (Keohane 1990, 8)

CHAPTER 3

SCHOOL FOR WOMEN ?

> A man ought to no more value himself for being wiser than a women, if he owes his advantage to a better education, than he ought to boast of his courage for beating a man when his hands were bound (Mary Astell "An Essay in Defense of the Female Sex 1772 in M. Sadker and N. Frazier 1973, 108).

Before looking into the schools' role in the gender-socialization process or any aspect of females' lives in school, it is important to first back up and remember a fact which is often excluded from any type of historical curriculum: schools were not places originally intended for females. That the exclusion of women from schools is often omitted from the history most often taught is an issue in itself, which will be further addressed in Chapter 10. Further, when finally admitted to these sacred halls of male education, women were not thought fit for the same rigors. Forgetting that women did not enter school in the same era as men is like forgetting that the winner of a race was off the starting block ten minutes sooner.

In a speech made by M. Carey Thomas, a leader in the fight for the higher education of women, to the Association of Collegiate Alumnae in 1907 one can begin to remember the place from which women have come.

> The passionate desire of the women of my generation for higher education was accompanied throughout its course by the awful doubt, felt by women themselves as well as men, as to whether woman as a sex were physically and mentally fit for it. . . . I cannot

> remember the time when I thought studying and going to college were the things above all others that I wished to do. I was always wondering whether it could really be true, as everyone thought, that boys were more clever than girls. Indeed, I cared so much that I never dared ask any grown up person the direct question, not even my father or mother, because I feared to hear the reply. I remember often praying about it and begging god that if it were true that because I was a girl I could not successfully master Greek and go to college and understand things to kill me at once, as I could not bear to live in such an unjust world (Quoted from Aileen S. Kraditor Ed. Up From the Pedestal, 1968 as written in Frazier and Sadker 1973, 39).

Nannerl Keohane (1990) addresses the history of women's education. It was during the early enlightenment that for "the first time, bold theories were put forward (especially in France) which held that women should be educated as a matter of course, with particular purposes in mind" (4). It was at this time that for the first time an educated woman was not a "rare phenomenon", and women's schools and seminaries began to develop. Also at this time, theories in the education of women were being developed (4).

By the mid-nineteenth century, the role of women as teachers became a necessary and common one in America. Women were needed to fill an emerging shortage of teachers. This created a problem, for if women were to educate all students, including boys, they themselves had to have access to variety of disciplines. If they were to teach the next generation of men the basics of math, science, and ancient Greek, then they needed to first be educated in these "masculine" subjects themselves (6).

However, his addition still did not change the philosophy of education for women a great deal. Women's colleges such as Mt. Holyoke and Wheaton, though intended for the higher education of women were not much different from the convents and dame schools of the past, there place being to

> make women more effective wives and mothers. That these traditional female roles were now to be extended into work as teachers and missionaries did not much alter the conception of what a well-educated female should be like. (6)

New theoretical changes in the late nineteenth century were developed by M. Carey Thomas, at Bryn Mawr College for women in 1884. She felt that not only should women be educated exactly as men, but that also their education should be used for the exact same reasons, that is, " to become educated persons, professionally active in law or medicine or scholarship, advancing the boundaries of learning as men had always done" (6). Likewise Wellesley, Vassar and Smith had opened with similar intentions; however, old values lingered. The ideal for women at these institutions was still to make women into teachers of humanity, good wives and mothers. Wellesley and Smith had the same curriculum as men's colleges, yet no real ideological change had taken place in the purpose for women's education. Even after the change in views on curriculum,

> the majority of the women in the women's colleges, from the 1860's right up into the 1960's went onto lead the kinds of lives women had for centuries. The relevance of Plato or biochemistry to their later lives was always quite unclear. (7)

It was not until the early seventies that the prestigious male colleges such as Princeton, Dartmouth, Yale, etc. began allowing the admittance of women undergraduates, offering liberal educations to both sexes. "They paid lip service, at least, to the ideal that men and women should have access to the same professional careers" (7). However, legal access to top education does not mean one will automatically receive the same treatment once inside the doors. How open those doors really even are is also questionable, as seen in the following letter sent by an Assistant Dean of Admissions at a large eastern state university to a high school he had visited. The letter was reprinted in the University of Massachusetts "Collegian," April 14, 1971.

> For this year we believe that any girl who ranks in the top fifteen percent with mid-500 boards who is recommended by you and in a good solid college program undoubtedly will be admitted. For the males drop it down to the top twenty-five percent with low 500's with the same characteristics should make it. (cited in M. Sadker and N. Frazier 1973, 40)

One point to keep in mind from this brief history is that at the roots of our educational system the,"kind of education that justifies our classing someone a genuinely educated person was originally designed to transform boys into men and was then extended to girls" (Martin 1990, 26).

CHAPTER 4

THE ROLE OF SCHOOL IN THE SOCIALIZATION OF GENDER

> The educational system does not add to or subtract from the overall degree of inequality and repressive personal development. Rather, it is best understood as an institution which serves to perpetuate the social relationships of economic life through which these patterns are set, by facilitating a smooth integration of youth into the labor force. (Gintis and Bowles 1976, 11)

Why would school, a place intended to foster growth, be interested in promoting roles which may be inhibiting to the full development of students? Gintis and Bowles in their work, Schooling in Capitalist America- Education Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life, see a major goal of the school as being to prepare students to participate in a life which upholds the status quo. Social reproduction studies in anthropology look at the ways by which school influences "the legitimation and transmission of ideologies supportive of status quo gender arrangements and the parallels between gender stratification in schools and society" (Goetz and Grant 1988, 187). Social reproductionists view educational settings as "major forces in the intergenerational transmission of gender, race and class stratification" (188). As mentioned earlier, a shift has taken place since the seventies from looking at gender-roles as formed by nature, to the realization that society forms many of the noted differences. In recognizing this idea, researchers are examining the motivations behind the socialization process.

> We note a major underlying change since 1978 in a shift away from structural studies documenting gender differences and distributional patterns of women and men in education towards process studies exploring how individuals acquire gendered identities and how gendered identities are crucial to the reproduction of social arrangements and cultural forms at the core of American society (Goetz and Grant 1988, 183).

Bowles feels that schools "create and reinforce patterns of social class, racial and sexual identification among students which allow them to relate 'properly' to their eventual standing in the hierarchy of authority and status" (11). This is a far cry from the idealistic view of education such men as Lester Frank Ward proclaimed in his 1872 book Education where he presented universal education as the "power, which is destined to overthrow every species of hierarchy" (quoted in Gintis and Bowles 1976, 26). Bowles views the educational system as very rarely attaining these high standards; school has on the average promoted neither sexual equality nor complete human development (18).

Goetz and Grant report on studies of how "formal and informal education experiences maintain status-quo gender relationships overtly and subtly" (187). The anthropological studies they speak of by Fine (1987) and Wood (1984) find that boys "learn and rehearse domination and denigration of women" (188), and that schools motivate this behavior. These power relationships and patterns of domination are thought to be encouraged by positions given in school. "Boys are assigned manipulative jobs while girls are given nurturant tasks. This complementary division is reinforced by boys being encouraged to lead and act whereas girls are encouraged to follow and watch" (185). (Chapters 6, 7 and 8 will look closer at this differential treatment in the classroom.) Changing these power relationships and changing women's status requires altering the "formal and informal socialization of boys as well as girls" (188).

If the above seems difficult to accept, one need only think of the message that is given to students simply in the structure of their school system, the gender of their teachers and the gender of the administrators. Administrators (usually men) are the authorities to whom children are sent when teachers (usually women) can no longer control them. Administration is the source of power and the final arbiter of right and wrong. A 1990 survey done by the American Association of School Administration found that women make up only 27 percent of the principals and 4.8 percent of the superintendents in the United States (cited in AAUW 1992a, 7). If the school system is inequitable at its core, if it can not see its own bias at its very foundation, then how could it possibly see the continuation of biases within the classroom?

4-1: CUBA: ONE CASE FOR SCHOOL AS ROLE SOCIALIZER

Why look at a country such as Cuba to help explain the use of the educational system to maintain or change existing gender roles?

> Revolutionary societies, such as Cuba, provide an excellent opportunity to study attempts at directed culture change since the radical and permanent restructuring of the entire society is a fundamental intended goal of the revolutionary process. (Hutchens and Chilcott 1989, 5)

Cuba is particularly applicable to this report as "one of the most striking features of Marxist social philosophy is its sexually egalitarian ideal" (1). Marx and Engels felt that "the origins of sexual exploitation lay in the economic foundations of society" (1), and that sexual inequality was a necessary element in the capitalistic economic system, which has its origins in the idea of private property (1). Under Marxist rule in Cuba, the demonstration of sexual bias was perceived as "counter revolutionary" (12).

Pre-revolutionary Cuba had rigid rules governing gender behavior. These behaviors stemmed from the model of the patrifocal family typical of the middle and upper classes in Latin America, which were based on the assumption of sexual inequality (2). With the revolution the egalitarian ideals of Marxism were "politically, socially and economically imposed upon the rigid traditional sexual ethos" (2). This became a major focus in the early days of the revolution. Recognizing that schools, as did Bowles, Freire, and many others, were strong promoters of social roles, "Cuban leaders, in attacking what they termed the 'capitalist-exploitive' status of women in Cuba . . . , the Revolution, chose education as their primary weapon" (2).

Marxism views schools as, "reflections of the social relations of society" (11); " . . . the social relations of the schooling process itself convey the 'hidden' content of schooling, that is the values, expectations and patterns of behavior which schools encourage" (from ideas of Kohn 1969 cited in Hutchens and Chilcott 1989, 11). For this reason, change in the formal curriculum became the main means for ideological reform. The new Cuban curriculum "is heavily oriented towards 'correct' political awareness-it is a continuing effort to raise the socialist consciousness of children in regard to sexual equality" (13).

Using education in Cuba to achieve sex equity can, in many ways, be seen as a success. Women have reached higher educational levels than earlier, participated in the political process, and joined the work force in jobs other than the typical ones such as servants, teachers and nurses (13). But all is far from the ideal.

> The behavior of women and the behavior of men towards women has been permanently and extensively changed in Cuba, but the sexual ethos, which has been more resistant to change is in a marked state of transition. (14)

Therefore, while women have made some gains in school and in the work place, old attitudes still persist. Many women still view themselves and are viewed by Cuban men primarily as wives, mothers and sisters in need of protection (15).

After thirty years, Cuba has still not reached its goal of sexual equality. Hutchens and Chilcott feel the breakdown comes not in the use of education as a model, but in the fact that nothing has been done to change socialization within the home.

> Despite the limited success, education is a vital force in directed culture change in Cuba. . . . Education as an instrument of directed culture change is successful in Cuba to the extent that it is because of the centralization of authority within the revolutionary framework of both education and the women's movement. (15)

This example was not chosen because of the great equality Cuban women have obtained. Rather, it was chosen to show how schools can be and are used to promote the hoped for structure of a society. If school can be effective in changing stereotypical sex-roles in society, then it can also be used to reinforce them.

4-2: U.S. POLITICS IN EDUCATION

Castro is not the only one who sees education as a means of changing the social structure or in other cases upholding the status quo. If one thinks the U.S. would be any less aware of educational institutions as means for continuation of roles, the following statement makes it clear that at least from the very top, well beyond the control of individual teachers, something is going on which continues to dictate who will be given what kind of education and why.

> President Reagan, for instance, claimed that one reason that the schools were failing was the attention that had been focused on female, minority, and handicapped students. He asserted that, if the Federal government had not been so preoccupied with the needs of these special groups of students, education in the U.S. might not have succumbed to the 'rising tide of mediocrity.' What the president failed to note is that, if these three groups of students are eliminated, only about 15% of the school population remains. (Shakeshaft 1986, 499)

In " A Gender at Risk," Carol Shakeshaft addresses the recent Reagan administration's ideology, which she feels blatantly and publicly sought excellence over equity in the school systems. What she finds even more distressing is the failure of the public to "see the reliance of excellence on equity" (499). Shakeshaft describes the rhetoric of President Reagan and Secretary Bennet as a "false and dangerous dichotomy. . . . Excellence and equity are different; equity threatens to take resources away from excellence; therefore let's abandon equity as a national concern so as to pursue excellence exclusively" (499). Teachers may desire true change in their classroom, however, they are not given the means or support to begin to make change, it is difficult to change the world alone. Furthermore it appears there are direct forces acting to disrupt that change.

To further emphasize this neglect of the majority of students,Shakeshaft finds fault in the foundations of the U.S. school system. She sees the whole idea of school as being based on goals and structures of the public sector, which has always been male dominated. She also feels, along with many others, that schools are designed around male development patterns. At what ages skills are introduced such as long division and essay writing are based on male stages of development, (white male development that is), which are, in the early years, behind girls' development (500). Shakeshaft concludes that in the research on gender and schooling two underlying messages can be heard repeatedly "first, what is good for males is not necessarily good for females. Second, if a choice must be made, the education establishment will base policy and instruction on that which is good for males" (500). Keeping in mind that school was first designed for boys, as referred to in Chapter 3, then none of this is surprising.

Myra Sadker and David Sadker who have done extensive research on gender issues in the classroom and written numerous texts reporting their observations and theories, give a good overview of the kinds of forces at work in U.S. school rooms today in their Sex Equity Handbook for Schools --a book which should be on the reading list of all education programs. The Sadker's have observed that in todays schools, while children are now told they can be anything they want to be, and that all doors of opportunity are open for them what happens in practice is very different. What happens in actuality is a subtle, "sorting, grouping, and tracking of minority and female students" (10), into traditional roles and jobs which may or may not reflect their unique interests and abilities. The continuation of this discriminatory teaching is carried out by a " hidden curriculum" , this quiet socializer being:

> The messages children receive about themselves and others of their sex and race through the illustrations, language, and content of textbooks, films, and visual displays; the ways in which administrators, teachers, and other students interact with them; the part they play in important school ritual and the extent to which they come in contact with influential role models of their own sex and race. (adapted from Borstein (1980) in Sadker and Sadker 1982, 10).

One example Stevenson (1974) gives on the perpetuation of roles is in the tracking of black girls in high school. They found that while white girls were somewhat less likely to work than black girls, more black girls were enrolled in the general curriculum which has little skill training. "Black girls enrolled in general curriculum experienced the most unemployment" (cited in Sadker and Sadker 1982, 18). This irony is typical of how curricula reflect an outdated status quo rather than recognizing and reacting to present reality.

Another window into differential treatment in school can be seen in school athletic programs in the U.S. Athletics, with their opportunity for unstructured interaction, are the main social occasions for many students in schools.(Elder and Parker 1987, 200). Elder and Parker found that because of the social and unstructured nature of sports, and their importance in our society, that sports may have a greater impact on adolescents' values and behaviors than teachers and class work do. Thus it is very important to look at what values sports represent. Elder and Parker compared two of the most popular sports in schools for males and females: football and cheerleading. "While athletics had the most influence on male peer culture, cheerleading had the most influence on female culture" (207). While football promotes aggression, achievement and competition, cheerleading fosters appearance and acceptance Elder and Parker feel that the great emphasis which cheerleading places on appearance and attraction has a direct effect on female culture. They found that girls, who in sixth grade were unconcerned about their appearance, became highly concerned with their physical attraction when cheerleading became an option.

> Besides the emphasis on appearance and emotion management, the implicitly sexual nature of cheerleading needs to be addressed. . . . the fact that cheerleaders are performing for male athletes and other male spectators may reinforce the perception of females as sexual objects. (Elder and Parker 1987, 211)

Schools often revolve around the fall football schedule, and going to high school games is a common family activity for many. The blatant gender specific nature of football which goes so unquestioned by society turns what some may feel is a fun weekend past time, into a real social issue, when equality in our schools is considered.

> The cultural significance of certain activities increased the visibility of certain groups of students, giving them higher statues in the school and thereby increasing the salience of values transmitted through those activities. These activities promoted traditional gender relations and values, showing how schools continue to play an important role in reproducing gender differences. (211)

Even when girls participate in more competitive sports they are likely to find, as the Michigan Department of Education Office of Sex Equity did in 1990, that in seventy percent of the school districts polled girls were not given comparable athletics opportunities to boys (cited in AAUW 1992a, 45). Females in athletics are likely to find less money available, equipment of poorer quality and a lack of desirable playing times and places. Girls, who are expected to attract fewer spectators, play on Wednesday night as opposed to the boys' Friday night game. This, of course, results in the fulfillment of the prophecy.

The ramifications and power and self image which result from this typical example of injustice are endless. Girls have far fewer chances to experience the prestige and popularity which results from excellence at athletics. This also means that girls have fewer chances to experience the important leadership and teamwork skills which sports develop. Furthermore physical activity is found to have other important outcomes affecting both the physical and mental health of sports participants. William Morgan of the University of Arizona found that both male and female athletes are, "less depressed, more stable and have higher psychological vigor than the general public" (cited in M. Sadker and D. Sadker 1982). The Women's Sports Foundation (1989) finds that Hispanic girls in high school athletics obtain some of the greatest benefits of any minority group from sports participation. Hispanic girls who participated in sports were found more likely to, "improve their academic standing while in high school, to graduate, and to attend college following high school" (as quoted in AAUW 1992a 45).

The physical and mental benefits of promoting an active life are undeniable. Similarly well-known are the monetary and status rewards of the life of a top athlete. However, here again we see an example of misguided attempts at excellence displacing necessary efforts at equity, as schools and universities continue to place men's athletics far above those of girls and women. Sports in the U.S. hold a very important role in our society. Televised sporting events attract far more viewers than political or so-called "socially important" events. Why then are sports rarely looked at as a political and social issue? Is it because their norms and values are so cultivated by our school systems from day one that they remain unquestioned? While math and science careers (see chapter 6) have come under scrutiny for not being "girl friendly," blocking females access to sports, one of the highest paying careers of all, is rarely questioned. Sports are of utmost importance in school and in society. Females' roles in them are marginal at best. Now lets move off the playing field and into the classroom.

CHAPTER 5

RESEARCH TODAY: RE-EXAMINING THE CHILLY CLIMATE, AND THE AAUW REPORT

Crawford and MacLeod in their 1990 study, focus on gender differences at the college level. Their research , " Gender in the College Classroom: An Assessment of the Chilly Climate for Women," was a continuation of the findings of Hall and Sandler (1982), of their original research into the classroom climate. What Crawford and MacLeod looked at specifically was to see whether "women and men behaved differently in the classroom, with women participating less often and less assertively" (Crawford and MacLeod 1990, 102). They also looked at the teachers role in discriminating against women.

What they found is that "women students perceived themselves to be less involved in the classroom than their male peers" (112); that they were likely to engage themselves verbally in class; and that males were more likely to feel part of and be more active in class (113). Though both sexes agreed on which types of classes fostered the best active participation, men and women were not free to or encouraged to participate equally. Male students perceived that they volunteer more often, that they are called on more often, when their hand is raised, and that the teacher responds more positively to their questions" (115). Though women felt they were known as well by their teachers, they noted they were less likely to volunteer, and felt less drawn into classroom conversations. They also responded that when they did offer information in class it was not received as well. On the questionnaire itself they found women more likely to elaborate on their ideas of participation. This may be due to their greater awareness of the problems.

> The overall picture is that female students feel less confident of their intellectual abilities. They seem to feel that they need to know a great deal and be very prepared before expressing their ideas in class, probably because they fear negative evaluations of teachers and other students. Men, looking to more external rationales, are less likely to reflect negatively on their own abilities (116).

One of Crawford and MacLeod's explanations for their findings is that they feel males have greater self confidence which allows them to be more assertive, even though their grades are lower. Chapter 7 will look more closely into why males may have this confidence which allows them to participate more freely. It will also address one possible reason why females receive higher grades.

Though teacher discrimination was found to be a factor in the original research by Hall and Sandler, Crawford and MacLeod did not find this to be the case. Students felt that teachers treated both sexes fairly equally (121). They did find that female teachers rated higher on being able to judge when a student wanted to speak whether their hand was raised or not (117). Female teachers also got a better grade in understanding students reasons for lack of participation. That is, they seemed more aware of the circumstances contributing to classroom participation. "The lower participation and involvement of students is best addressed by teachers who are aware of the gender differences, and use a variety of sensitive strategies to create a 'student-friendly classroom' " (121).

They concluded their report by stating that, "students believe neither female not male faculty actively discriminate against female students" (121).

These findings show that by the college level, students perceive no discrimination by teachers. However at the same time, awareness of unequal participation in the classroom is high. This is what makes this study so worrisome. Female students do recognize their own lack of participation; however they do not understand the cause. This lack of understanding promotes already existing feelings of inadequacy. As found in my own research, college students do feel that they are normally treated fairly, but there remains an awareness of the problems, and a real interest in studies of this sort. As was the case in my MAT class, many of the women were painfully aware of the passive role they found themselves playing. However, simple awareness does not explain origins or prescribe solutions. One can find peace in ignorance or lack of awareness, but there is something particularly frustrating about sensing a certain pattern , yet having no idea as to where it came from or what to do about it.

What this may show is that by the college level students have already been socialized into their gender roles so thoroughly that even equal treatment does not make for equal education. It seems that to best understand this situation that what we need to do is go back and look carefully at what happens to boys and girls at the elementary and high school levels.

Sports, as considered before, is but one of many areas in which early formal education socializes gender. One of the most important and comprehensive reviews of literature that examined these issues is the 1992 AAUW Report, entitled "How Schools Shortchange Girls. A Study of the Major Findings on Girls and Education." Commissioned by the AAUW Educational Foundation it was prepared and developed by the Wellesley College Center for Research on Women. Together they have recently compiled some of the most comprehensive research available on gender studies in the elementary and high school classrooms. The AAUW's first national study, done in 1885, was "initiated to dispel the commonly accepted myth that higher education was harmful to women's health" (AAUW 1992a V). They feel that the 1992 report sets out to dispel another myth, that boys and girls today receive an equal education.

Their work is a synthesis of all the available research dealing with girls in school. They feel it provides compelling evidence that boys and girls are not receiving the same quality or quantity of education. Their findings reveal that although boys and girls start out with equal ability, with girls above boys in some areas, that twelve years later girls have somehow fallen short, particularly in areas of mathematics, science and self-esteem. They conclude that after twenty years of research into gender studies and reform efforts for equity, "more has been said than done to improve schooling for girls" (AAUW 1992c, 1).

> The research reviewed in this report challenged traditional assumptions about the egalitarian nature of American schools. Young women in the U.S. today are still not participating equally in our educational system. Research documents that girls do not receive equitable amounts of teacher attention, that they are less apt than boys to see themselves reflected in the materials they study, and that they often are not expected or encouraged to pursue higher level mathematics and science courses, the implications are clear, the system must change. (AAUW 1992a 84)

The AAUW's report and its implications will be examined more closely in Part 2.

5-2: THE AUTHOR'S RESEARCH

In reading about the past and current research in gender and education, I too felt compelled to look into the classroom. Since my research will be referred to frequently, the following description is essential. The significance of my research is geographically, ethically and economically restricted. Findings are therefore limited in scope and transferability. However, they are interesting for what they reflect of the subjects and situations researched. (All research was done in December of 1992.)

A total of 129 elementary through high school students were involved in my research. The two public schools looked at were an elementary/middle school, and a high school, in Vermont. At the elementary school a 4/5 grade classroom, a 5/6 grade classroom and a 7/8 grade classroom were used. Students were given questionnaires, and observations were done during their Spanish class time.

At the high school level I also chose to observe language classes whose students were of mixed grades and ages. Students ranged from 14-17 in grades 9th through 12th. High school students were given the same survey as the elementary students, and were observed for a language class period. Five different language classes were used.

The breakdown in numbers of the students is 30 elementary girls, 27 elementary boys, 43 high school girls and 29 high school boys. The difference in high school numbers between the sexes reflected the lack of males in upper level language classes in schools. The seven teachers whose classes were observed were also given surveys.

Seventy-two Master of Arts in Teaching students from the School for International Training were also given questionnaires. Twenty two women and eleven men responded. A total of 13 teachers were also surveyed. Besides the 6 teachers from the elementary and high school whose classes were observed, 7 other teachers were included. Three university language teachers were given the Language teacher survey, though their classes are not included in the data, as the ratio of women to men was too high. Also included in the teacher information are 4 English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers. The ESL teachers responded to their multi-cultural classes; however their responses did not differ much from the other teachers and so were included.

All surveys were anonymous other than age and sex. The surveys were designed to consider a variety of gender issues. They will not be addressed in full, as the scale of questions is too large. The work will be inserted into chapters, where significant findings were found within the topics being discussed.

The following four chapters will look closely into the classroom studies in the areas of teacher/student expectations, teacher attention, and student participation. Chapter 10 will address the curriculum and its relation to gender bias. It is hoped that the following chapters will clarify the educational inequalities of gender and the consequences of these inequalities.

CHAPTER 6

INTO THE CLASSROOM: BIASES IN EXPECTATIONS

> The vicious circle of sexism begins with commonly accepted stereotyped associations regarding sex differences. These associations manifest themselves in different expectations for treatment of girls and boys in school. When students undergo different experiences, training and opportunities based on their sex, they may lose their individual academic, occupational, and personality potential. As adults these well-rehearsed students take up traditional functions at home, at work, and in the community. The perpetuation of these traditions reinforces stereotyped associations people hold about what is appropriate and natural for women and men, and the circle of sexism continues. (M. Sadker and D. Sadker 1982, 10)

"How can we expect the younger generation to believe sexes are equal if we treat them differently and have a totally different set of expectations for each" (MAT student female).

6-1: TEACHER EXPECTATIONS

The Sadkers name the vehicles for differential treatment of students as 1. textbooks and instructional materials, 2. curriculum, the plan of study, 3. teacher behavior, and 4. counseling and guidance. (cited in M. Sadker and

D. Sadker 1982, 21). All of the preceding areas will be addressed in this section, except for counseling and guidance. Teacher behavior in the form of expectations will be addressed first.

It is reported that from the moment boys and girls begin school, teachers already have some set expectations about their behaviors. Many teachers believe that their boys will be "noisy, aggressive, sloppy, poor at reading and good at mathematics" (M. Sadker and D. Sadker 1982, 19). As for female students, teachers "tend to expect that girls will be well behaved, quiet, neat, good at reading and poor at mathematics" (19). Research has long since discovered that teachers' beliefs and expectations consequently affect student achievement. "If teachers believe that first-grade boys will do as well in reading as girls do, then this will happen" (19 from work of Michael Parlady).

Dale Johnson in his study of "Sex Differences in Reading Across Cultures"(1973-74), proves the above hypothesis to be a reality. Johnson examined reading achievement in four countries: Canada, England, the U.S. and Nigeria. He found that differences in reading success corresponded strongly with teacher attitudes, which mirrored the attitudes of the country itself. In England and Nigeria boys scored higher in reading; in the U.S. and Canada girls received higher reading scores.

Much research in the U.S. has found elementary school girls to read better than boys (67). Johnson states that this has always been attributed to the fact that girls between seven and twelve years old are more developed than boys (70). If biology is the reason for girls' superior reading skills in the U.S., then, as Johnson set out to study, these statistics should hold true globally (70). This proved not to be the case.

> More than a thousand elementary children from grades 2, 4, and 6 in Canada, England Nigeria and the U.S. participated. Of the 72 comparisons (6 tests x 3 grades x 4 countries) 18 showed statistically significant sex differences. In England and Nigeria boys scored higher than girls on most tests, while in Canada and the U.S. girls generally scored higher than boys. Results of the study indicate that sex differences in reading ability as measured by tests may be related to cultural influence. (67)

So what are these influences? " In Canada and the U.S. the great majority of teachers (23 of 29) believed girls were superior readers" (81). While in Nigeria, all seven teachers surveyed thought boys to be better at reading than girls. In England, teacher attitudes were more mixed, with six expecting girls to be superior readers and three opposing this. Teacher expectations seem clearly to relate to student success. Likewise, societal expectations influence outcomes.

Maccomby (1966) writes that in the U.S. girls are expected to excel in school in the early years; boys, on the other hand, are encouraged towards sports when younger, and college and work later on in school (cited in Johnson 1973-74, 70). "For a sizable number of adults in North America reading is still considered a somewhat 'sissy' or 'feminine' pastime for young children. Many fathers would rather see their young sons toss a football or play hockey than stay inside and read a book" (83). In Nigeria however, which is a predominantly Muslim country, education is valued much higher for boys than for girls.

Society's view of acceptable educational roles for students, and thus the influence of these expectations on students, can be seen again in a study by Preston (1962). Preston compared German and U.S. students' reading skills. In Germany, boys were found to have higher reading scores than girls. Preston feels this is due to the "not easily identified element in German culture which results in the easy ascription of reading and learning to the normal activities of boys" (as quoted in Johnson 71).

Another possible factor in the results that both Johnson and Preston report is the sex of the majority of teachers. Preston cites that in Germany the majority of teachers are men. Johnson notes that in England and Nigeria the number of male teachers is higher than female teachers, while the opposite is true of Canada and the U.S. (82). The teacher as a role model may affect student achievement. A fourth element which Johnson did not discuss but acknowledges as important is the "content of beginning reading materials" (83). Reading materials may be geared more towards one sex or the other. This issue will be discussed further in Chapter 10.

As the above suggests, many factors influence student achievement. However it seems quite clear from these studies that expectations and attitudes both of the teacher and society greatly effect students learning. That these expectations and attitudes are generally gender based is alarming. Johnson concludes his report with the following thoughts;

> In this study most of the American teachers expected their girls to read better than their boys. How many American educators consciously or unconsciously view this difference as universal and unalterable? Would greater awareness of the apparent fact that girls do not innately read better than boys change educational practice? An investigation should be undertaken to asses teacher sex-role expectancies and relate teacher expectancy to pupil performance. Such a study could indicate a need for teachers to evaluate their attitudes and practices with regard to the reading and in the classroom activities, materials and expectations for all. (85)

Sadker and Sadker find differences in expectations and attitudes in many other areas of the classroom, often without a logical base. Girls who are normally larger and stronger than elementary boys are often ignored for activities requiring strength, such as carrying books (1982, 20). In an article on gender bias in the Springfield Union News of January 15 and 16, 1993, Patty Norris quotes one twelve year old girl on the topic of boys who are always asked to carry stacks of books back to the library. " '[My teacher will] never send girls' Rachel said. 'I don't think that it's fair that the teachers think the boys are always stronger than the girls, or think that they can do more, because it's not true' " (1E).

The Sadkers also report that "because of their assumed mechanical ineptitude, they [girls] do not have opportunities to operate complicated machinery like film projectors" (1982, 20). Boys are the ones most often asked to "do things" in the classroom. Is it any wonder then that as adults males are assumed more able, and at that point probably are more capable of working on, understanding, and fixing "things"? The AAUW feels that boys' expectations of being able to do a lot of "things" may be one factor in their higher self-esteem, to be addressed in Chapter 9.

Some of the most common gender biases in the U.S. are the much accepted notions that boys are better at math and science and girls are better at English and other languages. Weitzman (1984) writes that an earlier study reported that forty one percent of elementary and high school teachers he interviewed felt that "boys did better in mathematics, while none of them felt girls did better" (212). At the same time, it is often thought that "boys are less facile with language than are girls, although there is little conclusive research data supporting that opinion" (Price and Graves 1980, 147). In Macaulay's writing on "The myth of female superiority in language", he concludes that

> The evidence of consistent sex differences in language development is too tenuous and self-contradictory to justify any claims that one sex is superior to the other. In the present state

> of language assessment the only tenable position is that there is NO significant difference between the sexes in linguistic ability. (1977, 361)

Though the AAUW reports that "the traditional wisdom that girls are better in verbal areas while boys excel in quantitative skills is less true today" (1992a, 22), this author's research found many of these stereotyped expectations, particularly in linguistic bias, very much alive and well today.

> It seems like men do better at math and science and women do better at English. Maybe it's just different interests. Many teachers feel that way. . . The more people push gender issues the more separated we become. Equality comes through unity not division" (MAT student female).

6-2: STUDENT AND TEACHER EXPECTATIONS IN THE AUTHOR'S RESEARCH

The following question was asked of the MAT class, in looking at the issue of expectations: Do you think men are naturally better in certain academic subjects, and vice versa? If so which? If you do not think there is a difference, have you found that other teachers do?

Although one of the initial responses received was, "I know very few of either group who would dare to be so un-cool as to own up to such a belief even if s/he had it" (MAT student female), she may be surprised to find the results. Overall 21% of the group feels that there are essential differences in which subjects men and women perform best. All six of the women who feel there are essential differences believe those differences to be in the areas of math and science (favoring men) and the Humanities (language, art etc.) favoring women. The one man who feels that there may be essential differences believes that difference to be in philosophy, as there are not many women in this field.

The following are some of the MAT reactions:

"I don't think that one sex is generally better, but perhaps more interested in certain subjects. Men + engineering, technical subjects. business- - women humanities" (female).

"I have always thought that men are better in area of science, engineering, business, and math. Women more in English, language, humanities, arts and social sciences" (female).

"I think men are better at math and sciences while women are better at the arts" (female).

"Not here! I think society push men and women in certain direction (science v. literature) but no, there are no academic subjects which either sex perform in better" (female).

As shown above, some people (27%) volunteered the information that society, culture, etc., are factors in the making of who succeeds in what. While the above responses, where gender differences are assumed, may be correct in relation to what has been observed in the classroom, it is not enough to stop there. Just because something is a certain way, does not mean that it became that way naturally. As previously stated, in looking at gender differences one needs to go beyond the product, and look closely at the factory from which it came.

"I don' t think the difference is natural--I think our culture determines who will do well in what, and this colors our expectation. I think other teachers do think this way" (MAT student male).

Maybe the most insightful comment of all comes from a woman responding to whether males are better at certain specific subjects:

"Men, yes, Boys, no. Our society and schools socialize boys to achieve and not girls. Teachers are often part of that structure that socializes girls not to think. I know this well from my work . . ." (MAT student female)

The second question which had to do with expectations related directly to language learning ability. These findings should be of particular interest to much of the audience of this paper who may still feel that the subject of gender does not directly relate to language teaching. While 82% of the MAT respondents feel that men and women were equal when asked if they thought men or women as a group are better language learners almost one out of five respondents feel women are superior language learners. The significance of this figure is compounded when one considers that 0% named men as having superior abilities.

"On an individual basis, no: but as a group I suspect women use language and enjoy it more and work at it more"(MAT student male).

" I don't know if it's nature, I suspect it's nurture, but my best students in language classes have always been women" (MAT student female).

The language teachers surveyed were asked: From your experience who do you find are better language learners? Who does better in class? The teacher group is small (as described earlier), so individually the numbers are not highly significant, but when placed together, a definite trend is suggested. At the University level, one teacher stated that the sexes do equally well and two named women as superior. Of the four ESL teachers, three answered "equal," while one favored women. However, this response was noted in reference to viewing high school language learning, not the learning that takes place in their E.S.L. classroom.

"I don't think it's a gender determined characteristic--but in American high schools girls generally tend to be quicker, faster language learners than boys" (ESL teacher male).

At the high school, of the three teachers 2 stated equal, and 1 responded in favor of girls.

"Girls overall: I have had many excellent boys in class through the years also." (high school teacher female).

The elementary school teachers were asked a different question as they do not deal with language directly: Do you notice girls or boys as a group doing better in certain subject areas? If yes which? Of the three teachers 1 feels students have equal abilities, while 2 named language as an area in which girls appear to excel.

"Though it's a generalization, girls..nah. Each time I think of a content area I think one or the other gender has a predirection for it, then I think of the many exceptions. So my response is no" (elementary teacher male).

When all thirteen teachers' answers were put together, the following resulted: 54% feel that males and females will and do perform equally well in language learning, while 46% feel that females have an edge over males. These findings seem quite in keeping with traditional gender expectations. As with Earnest's mathematics survey, in which he found no teachers to assume female superiority in mathematics, what seems particularly significant is that of 46 MAT students and teachers of various levels combined, not one mentioned males as having superior language ability, while 12 named females as having such. Though Price and Graves in the below are writing on another study of assumed female superiority in language, their conclusions seem fitting to my own research.

> This study has important implications for teachers. Realistic attitudes and expectations among teachers concerning language use by students of both sexes help student realize their maximum potential in language use. Apparently the view that boys are less able with language than girls is widespread and tenacious, and it seems likely that language arts teachers may have expected and therefore gotten less from boys because of it. Teachers need also to be aware that their students culturally induced attitudes may be important consideration when they are trying to develop students language skills. (Price and Graves 1980, 152)

Do the students' expectations reflect those of their teachers, as would seem logical? When asked: 1) Do you think boys are better than girls in certain subjects? If yes which subjects? and 2) Do you think girls are better than boys in certain subjects? If yes which subjects?, the following responses were discovered. 61% of the high school girls feel boys and girls are equal in all subjects, and 39% feel there are essential differences. 56% of high school boys feel the sexes are equal, with 44% stating differences. Of the 28 students who feel there are differences between the sexes, 13 named boys as better at math and science subjects, while 15 felt girls superiority lay in English and other languages.

"If any it's math. In my math class the boys I sit with tend to pick up things better/quicker than I" (high school female).

"I think males often have an easier time with math and science - concrete learning- than females. Females tend to have an easier time with abstract ideas, like English class deal with" (high school female).

"I don't think they are but some people are just better students than others, not really having anything to do with their sex. Although I think a lot of girls are discouraged in taking math and science" (high school female).

At the elementary level we see a significant difference in how girls perceive their abilities. This supports the current literature which finds that girls are often freer of gender specific roles until middle school or high school. 77% of girls feel that boys and girls have equal abilities in all subjects. That means 16% more elementary girls than high school girls feel the sexes to be equal in ability. In contradiction to the girls' findings, the boys' perceived equality made a 12% drop, for while 56% of the high school boys feel that the sexes are equal, only 44% of the elementary boys feel this way. More than half of the elementary boys think there are essential differences between the sexes.

As for which subjects the elementary students feel that boys and girls have different abilities in, the typical math/science bias found in both the MAT surveys and the high school surveys is not found in the elementary students. Of the 20 boys and girls who feel there are differences between girls and boys abilities, only 3 students state boys as being better in mathematics, while 6 actually have math under subjects in which girls excel. This finding is very interesting because it seems to agree with other studies that find that, "girls' performance in math plummets at around age twelve when adolescence makes them more aware of social roles" (in Weitzman 1984, 212). The AAUW (1991) finds that while half of elementary boys and one third of elementary girls like math, those numbers change to 1 in 4 and 1 in 7 respectfully in high school (12). The elementary students' perceived differences in English/language ability seems more consistent with the high school findings, with 8 students feeling girls have a better facility with these subjects.

The elementary students seem much more aware of stereotypes, and concerned with negating them, as seen in the following comments to the question of whether girls and boys are better at specific subjects. Maybe because elementary students have not been so socialized to their roles, the question seems a silly one, as it should. Or maybe these students are representative of a newer and more aware generation. Another option may be that this particular elementary school is more gender equitable than others. Whichever may be the case, it seems well worth further exploration. For if this school is promoting these more positive and equal attitudes, finding out how it is being done is important. If, on the other hand, it is that students themselves are much more free of gender roles and expectations, then we need to learn how to keep them this way through high school.

"No [I don't think there are differences], If I had agreed with that I would be a sexist person" (female grade 7/8).

"Maybe in gym boys have an advantage but both girls and boys are good at whatever they do" (male grade 5/6).

"The boys think they are better at sports, but that's a stereotypical lie. Only individual girls and boys are better at certain things" (male grade 5/6).

"Sometimes athletics but that's because boys are encouraged from a very young age and find that it is expected of them" (female grade 7/8).

When asked the more specific question: Who do you think is better at learning languages?, the following were the results. Of high school girls, 67% responded that males and females are equal in language ability, while 33% responded that females are better language learners. With the boys, 72%

answered equal while 28% felt girls had more ability. Even the more liberal elementary students perceptions on language ability are only slightly different from the above. Again, the girls who feel there are no differences according to sex is higher than the high school girls, at 73%, while 27% write that girls are better at language. 63% of boys answered equal while 26% feel girls have superior language ability. 11% of the elementary boys responded that they are better at language. This is the only place of all the groups surveyed where anyone names males as having an advantage. This finding seems to provide more evidence that from high school on roles become much more known and rigid.

Some of the reasons given by students for their perceptions that females are better at language are as follows:

"It seems that girls adhere to language better than boys" (high school male).

"Cuz...women have more of a tendency to work with language" (University female).

"I think girls have more interest" (high school female).

While much has been written lately about the chilly climate for girls in math and science, not much has been written on those subjects in which boys may be shivering. One important reason to keep in mind over the publicity of math/science bias in schools is that math and science careers are, on the average, the most prestigious and lucrative jobs. This makes the issue an economic one. Women will not have equal access to many high-paying jobs without strong training in math and sciences. Adelman (1991) found "wage differential favoring men are considerably less or disappear altogether for women in their early thirties who have earned eight or more mathematics credits in college" (cited in AAUW 1992a, 4). The AAUW also found math and science success to be positively linked with confidence and self esteem (AAUW 1991, 16). But what about the boy who feels passion for language? Are many males not given equal access in the language fields? How many boys are not encouraged, or are discouraged from recognizing their dreams in female dominated areas? Biases in expectations in society and school hurt everyone.

That these kinds of expectations remain so rampant means that we are raising another whole generation whose aspirations may be curtailed. Teachers, graduate students, high school students, and elementary school girls in this survey feel that if anyone, it is women who have greater language capability. That boys name themselves as possibly having an upperhand on language only in the elementary school, seems to be particularly telling of a nation which claims equality for all, but practices it only within certain boundaries. People may be told as children that they can do any thing they want, but as the above shows around high schools the roles of gender become more defined, and anything you want becomes a slightly different story. Whether it starts with teacher expectations, student expectations or some of both the biased winds of society's expectations of people continue to blow through the classroom.

Members of a New Guinea tribe studied by anthropologist Margaret Mead in the early 1930's believed that only a baby born with its umbilical cord wrapped around its neck would grow up to be an artist. Astoundingly, such babies did grow up to become artists. And no matter how hard and long other tribe members practiced, they never became accomplished artists. (M. Sadker and D. Sadker 1982, 9 from writings of Meade 1935)

CHAPTER 7

ATTENTION

> Whether one looks at preschool classrooms or university lecture halls, at female teachers or male teachers, research spanning the past twenty years consistently reveals that males receive more teacher attention than do females. (AAUW 1992a, 60)

7-1: WHO GETS IT AND WHAT KIND ?

The AAUW names the many faces which gender bias in attention within the classroom can take. Disparities in the giving of attention can have both indirect and direct forms:

> With teachers calling on boys more often than girls, encouraging more assertive behavior in boys than in girls, evaluating boys' papers for creativity and girls for neatness, and giving boys the time and help to solve problems on their own, but 'helping' girls along by simply telling them the right answer. (AAUW 1992b, 9)

The AAUW reports on a study done by the State of Kentucky Department of Education, "Teacher/Student Classroom Interaction in Vocational Education. A Sex Bias/ Sex Stereotyping Project." This study observed 245 vocational education classes at the high school and post secondary school level. Their conclusions showed that "males consistently received a disproportionate number of teacher comments and that the male/female disparity was even greater in high school classrooms than it was at the post secondary level" (AAUW 1992a, 69). Teaching experience or sex of the teacher did not appear to make a difference in their results, although "training in classroom interaction strategies" did (69). In other words, given adequate training, improvement is possible.

In a study done in Springfield, Massachusetts by Rosetta Grimm, former Coordinator of Inclusion and Integration in the Springfield Public Schools, "Grimm and colleagues found that after studying the behavior of 35 teachers, boys were called upon eight times more than girls" (Norris 1993, 1E). Norris quotes Grimm as saying that "girls aren't given a lot of the attention because we think they are already off to a good start. Some think the girls don't need it" (1e).

These differences in attention begin from the first day of school. The AAUW reports that at the preschool level teachers tend to pick activities which, "appeal more to boys' interests and to select presentation formats in which boys excel or are encouraged more than girls" (AAUW 1992a 60). Pre-school often focuses on small muscle development, impulse control training, and language enhancement. Because boys lag behind girls in these areas, teachers are apt to focus more of their attention on boys (AAUW 1992a, 18, from work of Greenberg 1985). "Indeed, one study of children from educationally advantaged homes found that pre-school experience reduced sex differences in language achievement scores between girls and boys--by raising boys' scores (AAUW 1992a 18, on work of Larsen and Robinson (1989)).

Another means by which it was concluded that pre- school programs use methods more conducive to the development of boys was in studying boys and girls in middle and high schools who had participated in Headstart programs. These students had been exposed to one of four different types of curricula. When compared, the highest scores were achieved by boys who had been in a Montessori class which is a type of self guided and independent curriculum. The second highest scoring group were girls who had been in a program that emphasized more formal group instruction.

> While the formal, didactic program relied more on observation than 'hands on' experience, it also provided equal opportunities for all students to engage in some manipulation, such opportunities are not always available for girls in co-ed groups, when boys tend to dominate. (21)

However, it is the first type of instruction, the more independent, that pre-schools are most likely to give. The above is not a call for more formal classrooms, for almost all students learn better with active participation. What this does show is that when a co-ed group is working in an active and independent way, girls are more likely to not get their fair share of hands on time.

Progressing beyond pre-school, science classrooms have been found to be "particularly biased in favor of boys" (70, from work of Brophy (1981), Gardner, Mason and Matyas 1989). Math classes were rated badly for both girls and some boys, in that a few males received attention, while the rest of the class was ignored (70, from work of Sadker and Sadker 1981). Weitzman reports that Becker (1981), in her observations found that of high school geometry classes, "seventy percent of all teacher encouragement was given to males" (1984, 289). She also reports that ninety percent of the criticism was given to girls, and that "females students were observed becoming more passive during the year" (290).

An interesting finding to note in relation to attention biases in math and science class is found in an article by Leo (1990). Leo reports that at women's colleges, women take more math and science classes, and do better in them than at co-educational institutions. If in a women's college there are no men to give more attention to, then women receive it instead. If women are then performing better in women's colleges than in co-educational situations, the argument that there is partiality in attention in co-ed settings and that it has negative effects on females seems an accurate one.

On the "chilly" side for boys, we find biases in teacher attention in reading class. John McNeil (1962) found that in reading classes boys received more negative feedback and were given less opportunity to read (cited in M. Sadker and Frazier 1973, 93). If females receive particularly biased attention in math and science classes and boys receive unequal attention in reading, we can hypothesize that boys are also slighted in language classes, though no studies were found on this topic.

Not only is the amount of attention different, but also the kinds of attention students receive is distinct. In a study of lecture classes teachers were found to ask males 80% more academically-related questions than females (AAUW 1992a 76). Serbin and O'Leary (1975) in their study of pre-schools found teachers gave boys more praise, and were twice as likely to have extended conversations with them. They also found that teachers were more likely to "do things" for girls even though "years of experience have shown that the best way to learn something is to do it yourself" (M. Sadker and D. Sadker 1985 b, 56). Instead of encouraging girls to discover answers and find solutions on their own, teachers are more likely to take over tasks being worked on by girls and tell girls answers more often than boys.

Rothchild, in looking at the Coast Guard Academy, observed that while instructors gave detailed instructions to men, they were found "doing jobs and operating equipment for female students" (M. Sadker and D. Sadker 1985b, 56). This is reminiscent of the previous chapter in which males were thought to be more able to "do things." This expectation may result from the inordinate amount and style of attention given to boys. Conversely, the different form of attention given boys may increase their perceived ability to "do things." Whatever the case, when females are not given equal experiences in learning to perform functions, they are trained to be more dependent.

Praise, as a subset of attention, was also found to be biased. In a three-year study on 100 fourth, fifth and sixth graders, the Sadkers (1984) looked at four types of teacher comments which they identified as praise, acceptance, remediation, and criticism,

> They found that while males received more of all four types of teacher comments, the difference favoring boys was greatest in the more useful teacher reactions of praise, criticism, and remediation. When teachers took the time and made the effort to specifically evaluate a student's performance, the student receiving the comment was more likely to be male. (AAUW 1992a, 69)

"Boys are praised more often than girls for the intellectual content and quality of their work, while girls are praised more for neatness and form" (1992b 20). Furthermore, "when teachers criticize boys they often tell them that their failing is due to lack of effort. Girls are not given this message, suggesting that effort would not improve their results" (20). Weitzman

(1984) reports that while only 54% of negative work related criticism for boys was given for "intellectual ability," 88% of girls' negative work feedback was "specifically addressed to their intellectual performance" (1984, from work of Dwick et al. 1978). As a result, girls may find their lack of success at a subject more of a personal failure than boys who view difficulties "more often as a problem with the subject matter itself" (AAUW 1991, 13). The AAUW found girls more likely to say they are not smart enough to accomplish certain goals than boys.

Much of the educational research that has been done has focused on white middle- and upper-class children. "Research on teacher-student interaction patterns has rarely looked at the interaction of gender with race, ethnicity, and/or social class" (AAUW 1992a, 70). In the work which has been done the results are not surprising. White boys are found to receive more attention than boys of any other racial or ethnic group (AAUW 1992a, 70, from Sadker and Sadker 1985). The data is more complicated for girls. Black girls, while found to have less interaction with teachers than white girls, attempted to initiate interaction with teachers rather more often than white girls. "Research indicated that teachers may unconsciously rebuff these black girls, who eventually turn to peers for interaction, often becoming the class enforcer or go-between for other students" (70, from Damico and Scott 1987, and Grant 1978).

Scot-Jones and Clarke (1986) found that teachers encourage black girls in non-academic areas more than in academic. They are more often praised for behavior, not work. White girls are found to be given tasks with higher responsibility more often than black girls or boys (524). Black girls are the recipients of less reinforcement and encouragement from teachers than all other students, even when their performance is better than the boys (Damico and Scott 1987, 70). This data reminds us that the findings reported in this document largely refer to white students. While considerable biases have been found between white males and white females, we can predict that biases between various ethnic groups and whites would be much greater.

7-2 : THE AUTHOR'S RESEARCH ON ATTENTION

As a teacher, have you noticed yourself giving more attention or having to give more attention, to one sex or the other? If yes, why do you think this is? This was the question asked of the MAT students and the teachers surveyed.

"Probably boys because I like them better than girls" (MAT student female).

"I think I give more attention to men, even though I try not to" (MAT student female).

"Over the years I have probably favored the girls over the boys simply I suspect because they tend to be a little sharper" (MAT student male).

"To women because I want to counter balance all the male focus of the system" (MAT student female).

Overall, the MAT student findings did not produce very significant results in self-perceived biases. 70% feel they give equal attention to both sexes, while 15% state they give males more attention and 15% believe they give females more attention. Interestingly, all of the men who perceived differences in their attention giving say they give more to women. The majority of the women who perceived differences in treatment said they pay more attention to men, with only 9% saying they give more to women. It would be interesting to actually observe these teachers in action, to see if the men's findings actually disagree with other research. The teachers surveyed were more in agreement with the national statistics.

"Because the male nature is competitive they are always fighting to be the first to give answers. Their assertiveness, unfortunately, gets a response" (ESL teacher female).

Of the thirteen teachers, nearly two-thirds said they give or have to give equal attention to both males and females, while 38% said they gave/had to give more attention to males. Given the fact the teachers usually underestimate the amount of attention given to males and that none of the teachers report giving more to females, these findings are gloomy. The reason often given for having to pay more attention to males is discipline problems. Issues of discipline will be discussed shortly.

Two different questions were asked of students to prompt thought on attention perceptions. The first question was direct: Who do you think gets more attention in class? Both high school boys and girls state a fairly high perception of equality (71%). What is interesting is that equal numbers of boys and girls think that the other sex gets more attention. The major finding here is the change in boys perceptions between elementary and high school. In high school 25% of boys think girls get more attention however, in elementary school 21% of boys think that they themselves get more attention. In other words, the boys reversed their position. The elementary girls are more consistent. They perceive slightly less equality than the high school girls, 67% feeling equal attention is given and 27% feeling boys get more attention.

The elementary students' perceptions of who is getting attention is much more on target with other findings and with the teachers feelings in this survey. High school girls also seem in agreement with the data. However, that high school boys perceive girls as getting more attention is very interesting. Do boys at this point begin to understand that society finds them more important, and so feel they deserve more attention than they get? This could be one hypothesis. The fact that the survey was done in the language classroom should not have affected the numbers, as the high school students were told to think about the overall situation, not just how they felt about the specific class they were in. Observations were not done on who teachers actually gave their attention to.

The second question asked in reference to attention was: Do you ever feel ignored in class? Of the total number of girls almost three-quarters said they sometimes feel ignored, but less than one-quarter said they "never" feel ignored. Overall for boys, 55% said they sometimes feel ignored while 38% responded "never". It seems most useful to look at the "never" responses. At the high school level, the "never" responses are somewhat close, with girls at 30% and boys at 38%. However, at the elementary level we see a significant difference; 33% of the boys responded that they never feel ignored while only 10% of the girls said they never feel ignored. What causes this difference? Does this mean that girls come to expect to be ignored by high school, that they grow accustomed to getting less attention? Or do girls really receive more attention in high school? This conclusion would go against most of the findings thus far. Can we ignore that elementary girls are 23% more likely than boys to feel ignored?

My overall findings on attention show that 38% of the teachers surveyed feel they have to give somewhat more attention to males, while no teachers mentioned giving more to females. Approximately 25% of all girls and 21% of elementary boys also perceive boys as receiving more attention with no females responding girls. Only at the high school do boys break this pattern. It seems fairly safe to assume then, that if anyone is getting more attention in class, it is males. Why does this happen? The reason most often given by the teachers for differences in attention focused on disciplinary problems. Many students, like their teachers, also perceive males getting more attention because of their tendencies to "act up."

7-3 : THE BENEFITS OF "ACTING UP"

"I think I definitely give more attention to boys perhaps because they usually cause more problems than girls" (MAT student female).

" [men] because they usually cause more uproar so they need more attention . . . (University student female).

"Behaviorally-boys. They seem to act out more, are less cowed by 'authority', are less secure and needy of attention. . . These are various speculations" " (elementary teacher male).

Who gets in more trouble in class? The results of this question will probably surprise no one. Of all high school and elementary girls, 63% responded that boys get in more trouble, 38% say equal, and 0% name girls. Of the combined boys' scores, 86% say boys, 12% say equal and 2% say girls.

The only major differences in breakdown is seen between elementary and high school girls where 14% more of the elementary girls think that they are just as likely to get in trouble. As for what kind of trouble students get into, both students and teachers agreed that

> "Girls generally get stopped for talking, boys tend to be more destructive/disruptive" (high school teacher female).

In a 1965 study by BJ Kemer, junior high teachers were asked to "describe good female and male students" they came up with the following list. Good females were described as appreciative, calm, conscientious, considerate, cooperative, mannerly, poised, sensitive, dependable, efficient, mature and thorough. Good male students were said to be active, adventurous, aggressive, assertive, curious, energetic, enterprising, frank, independent and inventive (cited in M. Sadker and D. Sadker 1982, 99).

> "I've tried to give equal attention to members of both sexes. Usually however, I found that I gave imbalanced attention when someone of either gender is more aggressive . . . "(MAT student male).

> "Sometimes I've given more attention to boys in Japan because they are less embarrassed, more often tell jokes, more often bring other students into the class. Girls are sometimes too 'perfect.' No I'm not proud to say this" (MAT student female).

The above two quotes, combined with the list of good student characteristics, should be considered carefully. Although behavior problems are usually thought to be negative, upon closer consideration, "acting up" may actually be a positive behavior. We know boys generally get in more trouble in school. We have just read that they also tend to get more attention and, we will later see, that they actively participate in class more often. These benefits may stem from their greater ability to avoid pressures to conform, to misbehave and to question authority. Teachers and society traditionally encourage these abilities more in males than in females.

> Observant anthropologists have suggested that the basic values of the early grades are a stylized version of the feminine role in society, cautious rather than daring, governed by lady like politeness. Girls in the early grades who learn to control their fidgeting earlier are rewarded for excelling in their feminine values. The reward can be almost too successful in that in later years it is difficult to move girls beyond the orderly virtues they learned in their first school encounters. The boys, more fidgety in the first grades get no such reward, and as a consequence may be freer in their approach to learning in the later grades. (Sadker and Frazier 1973, 95 as found by Bruner 1966)

"The boys in my classes are usually the loud mouths that just shout out comments and the girls usually only say what is asked" (University student female).

M. Sadker and N. Frazier (1973) believe that elementary school reinforces the roles that young girls may already be bringing in to the classroom from home, the role of being passive, sweet, quiet and neat. They feel that reinforcing this behavior in the classroom is a "bizarre distortion of the learning process" (96).

> Neatness, conformity, docility, these qualities for which the young girl receives good grades and teachers praise have little to do with active intellectual curiosity, analytical problem solving and the ability to cope with challenging material. (96)

Boys have been raised for the first five years under a different system of values. The world of young boys is most often full of games and outside adventures. When boys are loud and disruptive, a commonly heard phrase is "boys will be boys." As many laundry detergent commercials tell us, boys and men work hard, play hard and get dirty.

> Thus, the young boy must spend approximately a thousand hours a year at an institution that restrains and checks him. This lack of comfortable fit between the more active behavior allowed at home and the passivity demanded in school may force young boys into open rebellion. (89)

Frazier and Sadker found that boys received eight to ten times as many control messages as girls, messages such as "that's enough," and that teachers were more likely to use angry or harsh tones with boys (1973, 89). Feldman and Sears (1966) report on this issue that "one consequence might be a cumulative increase in independent, autonomous behavior by boys as they are disapproved, praised, listened to, and taught more actively by the teacher" (cited in Sadker and Frazier 91).

> Boys get in more trouble, "because they often talk back . . just run their mouth . . try to be smart" (high school female).

Weitzman reports on similar findings which say teachers react more intensely and frequently to aggressive behaviors in boys. One possibility for this is that disruptive behavior by boys is thought of as more dangerous or threatening than disruptive behavior by girls. She quotes Serbin (1973) as saying "another possibility is that teachers believe boys to be less responsive to reprimand--and habitually give them more 'intensive' attention" (Weitzman 1984, 174). The problem is that this may reinforce the behavior and make boys less attentive to negative reactions. This may not be such a bad situation; for if boys become used to being reprimanded and become aware that somehow it is thought more in their nature to cause problems, they become freer to say and act as they wish.

Girls, on the other hand, as their good behavior is praised, end up much more concerned with positive reward seeking. This often has a negative effect on learning because "students are anxious to receive good grades and teacher praise they hide their academic weaknesses from the teacher and avoid situations of intellectual challenge" (Silberman, cited in M. Sadker and Frazier 95).

Are the better grades that girls receive actually bad? Is it possible that the higher grades girls obtain reflect the fact that they are more concerned with rewards and approval than boys? In this case, simple grades misrepresent the actual quality of the education the two sexes receive. Girls emphasize approval to the exclusion of the other skills learned by "acting up." Does this mean, as the research is saying, that girls and women are less likely to challenge themselves academically for fear of not getting an A grade? If this is true, if women and girls seek more approval and rewards in the classroom, if they are trained to be more passive and accepting in school and in life, then they would be less likely to speak up, make waves, and actively participate in class. Being able to "act up" may be a real skill that is not included in the education of girls.

CHAPTER 8

WHO'S PARTICIPATING?

" . . . I think men are socialized (in the U.S.) to take risks and experiment more-as a result we are often more bold/less timid in some situations. Still it is dangerous to generalize." (MAT student male)

" . . . As an undergrad. it seemed like men led the discussions and their willingness to speak (and disagree/be disagreed with) caused them to receive more attention. They didn't worry so much about confrontation with classmates. I always felt kind of in awe with my professors." (MAT student female)

> Some critics claim that if teachers talk more to male students, it is simply because boys are more assertive in grabbing their attention- a classic case of the squeaky wheel gets the oil. In fact, our research shows that boys are more assertive in the classroom. While girls sit patiently with their hands raised, boys literally grab teacher attention. They are eight times more likely than girls to call out answers. (Sadker and Sadker 1985, 56)

Boys and men have been found to be more active participants in almost all classrooms. In a recent Carnegie Foundation book, College: the Undergraduate Experience in America written by E. Boyer (1986), it is reported that "in most classrooms women are overshadowed. Even the brightest women students often remain silent" (quoted in Smith 1990, 182). Another study by G. Krupnick (1985) found that "male students dominated class discussion in all the Harvard classes she studied" (Smith 1992, 182). The same was found at the high school and elementary levels. The Sadkers studied one hundred 4th, 5th, 6th and 8th grade classes in four states and the District of Columbia included were boys and girls both black and white from urban, suburban and rural ares. Half of the observations were done in English/language arts classes and half in math/science classes.

> In all communities and in all subject areas, boys dominated classroom communication. They participated in more interaction than girls did and their participation became greater as the year went on (Sadker and Sadker 1985, 54).

Not only do males volunteer more information but they are also chosen more often by teachers to be active participants. The AAUW reports on a 1987 study by Tobin and Garnett (87), and Kahle (1990), who found that in science classes, boys carried out 79% of the demonstrations (cited in AAUW 1992a, 72). The Sadkers discovered in their studies of elementary and middle school students that boys were eight times more likely to call out answers. In reaction, the teacher most often listened to the comment. On the other hand, when girls called out they were "usually corrected with comments such as, 'Please raise your hand if you want to speak'" (cited in 1992a, 68). Studies also have shown that when boys do not volunteer, "the teacher is more likely to solicit their responses" (cited in 1992a, 68).

> "[In] gym boys are chosen more often to help out or show a play" (high school female).

Numerous studies have found that when teachers are asked who participates and is called on more in class, they feel that boys and girls participate equally or that girls participate more (M.Sadker and D. Sadker 1985). Relying on teacher and student perception for gender studies in communication does not seem to provide accurate results. Swaker (1985) found that when people are asked who they think speaks more, people more often say women. In actuality behavioral research has repeatedly shown that overall men speak more (cited in Pearson 5 1987).

> When we showed teachers and administrators a film of a classroom discussion and asked who was talking more, the teachers overwhelmingly said the girls were. But in reality, the boys in the film were out-talking the girls at a ratio of three to one. Even educators who are active in feminist issues were unable to spot the sex bias until they counted and coded who was talking and who was just watching. Stereotypes of garrulous and gossipy women are so strong that teachers fail to see this communication gender gap even when it is right in front of their own eyes. (M. Sadker and D. Sadker 1985b, 54)

The author's research found similar same results with the teachers and high school students. In questioning teachers as to who participates more, the majority feel that males and females participate equally. In looking at students' perceived participation, the following two questions were included on the student survey. Students were asked first: Do you like to speak in class? The number of yes answers in response to this question will be focused on.

While 44% of the elementary boys said yes they liked to speak in class, 47% of the girls responded yes. Both scores go down at the high school level; however, boys' scores only drop to 41% while the girls' scores dropped to 30%. That is a 17% drop in girls who say they like to participate in class between the elementary and high school levels. This is a significant drop.

Students were then asked, Who do you think speaks more in class? In high school, while 67% of girls and 61% of boys answered that they thought girls and boys spoke equally, over a quarter of both sexes responded that girls speak more. Only 7% of the girls and 11% of the boys responded that boys speak more.

So who really participates more in class? Observations were done in each of the 8 surveyed classes. The number of times girls and boys responded were counted. The following types of responses were counted: 1) open responses when students just called out answers. 2) direct responses, where students were called on by teachers, 3) comments, and 4) questions. In this paper, all four of these types will be combined, to see who speaks more overall; though looking at them separately would also be useful.

In four out of five of the high school classes the boys spoke between 16%-23% more than the girls. However, in the fifth class, in which the teacher has since told me she tries to be very aware of the girls in class, the girls spoke almost twice as much as the boys. It is important to note that all of the teachers who were observed knew what the observer was looking at, so this may have affected the results. However, it seems likely that any change in teacher behavior would have increased the focus on the girls.

Even more elementary boys thought girls spoke more. While 41% responded that boys and girls speak equally, just as many felt that girls speak more than boys. The girls, however, disagreed. Half the girls responded that they spoke as much as boys. But only 13% of the girls felt that they spoke more than boys. What did careful observation reveal? The boys were right. In all three classes the girls spoke more, though not as much more as the high school boys. The elementary girls spoke between 4-15% more, so had an average of 8% more speaking time.

Though my data on the elementary students does not match that of other research shown, this is both a positive an negative result. It is positive in obvious ways. This difference between my work and the work of others may have something to do with this specific grammar school; or maybe a new generation is emerging. It may be that elementary students are not as genderized yet. Further research is needed. The negative side is that in comparing the grammar school and the high school, we see almost a 30% drop in girls' participation (excluding the fifth class). If we consider that the observations were done in language class, as opposed to science class where research tells that girls participate even less, this loss of voice between elementary school and high school is precipitous, yet typical.

The Sadkers feel that the results of these kinds of biases in participation (who is encouraged to speak, who speaks, and who thinks who speaks more) set up patterns which give "men more dominance and power than women in the working world" (1985b, 57). This lack of participation leads to 1) men speaking more often and interrupting women more frequently, 2) men remembering more of what male speakers say than females even when the same material is being discussed in the same style 3) women becoming less active in conversations and doing more gazing and smiling, 4) women using more tentatives like "I guess" or "kind of," or adding tag questions to their statements. These issues were not looked at in this research. Yet what the past, current, and my high school level students' data say is that females, are usually not as active in class. This lack of participation has negative ramifications, for most know the importance that active involvement takes in education. Studies such as Goodland's A Place Called School have shown that students who participate actively are more likely to feel good about and succeed in school (cited in M. Sadker and D. Sadker 1985b).

John Leo (1990), offers what he sees as a reason for females' lower participation rates in schools.

> One thing that shows up in almost every study is the finding that male students talk more in class and command more attention from teachers. We have all read a lot about teachers looking past females to call on males. But this is not a conspiracy, as many feminists imagine. Most teachers do not set out to shortchange females. It is a clash of classroom styles in which the males, more inclined to interrupt, take risks, show off and talk off the top of their heads, tend to eclipse the more orderly and less aggressive style of female.

His feelings bring us back to the original discussion in this paper about boys acquiring different learning styles because of the different behavioral expectations placed on them. The element that Leo leaves out is that these participation patterns were brought about by teachers and others. No, it by no means represents a conspiracy. The point is that because of many factors of sex role socialization, teachers react to students differently; students behave differently; certain behaviors often get more attention; more attention leads to better education, and so on. There is no "bad guy" here. What remains are facts and feelings which teachers need to be made aware of.

Back to the issue of learning styles. In "A Gender at Risk" (1986) Carol Shakeshaft speaks of the "I win you lose" concept as a problematic one for females. It has been observed in much research (including Piaget's) that children play differently: girls tend to end games when disputes arise; on the other hand, boys are often observed quarreling. Weitzman writes on work by Marciano (1984), who looked at female socialization and how it affects their work. "Marciano asserts that this socialization handicaps girls in the world of work because they do not practice competition, assertiveness, and winning; instead of putting their own goals forward, girls are more likely to be concerned with the needs of others" (Weitzman 1984, 173). While these characteristics are not negative ones, they can "handicap" females, as

Weitzman says because, "girls are oriented towards approval of others even in situations where independence is called for" (173).

For the above reasons, competitive activities, which are so often used in school, may not be the best learning activities for females. The following study by Weisfeld et al. (1983) "The Spelling Bee: A Naturalistic Study of Female Inhibition in Mixed Sex Classrooms" shows how competition-based activities may hinder girls' participation.

The study focused on two cultural groups who have a strong matriarchal focus. The girls were upper class blacks and members of the Hopi nation. "The cultural aspect of this study focused on whether or not the cultural view of the status of women influences the strength of female inhibition" (695). The study hypothesized that the Hopi girls would have less inhibitions in a mixed sex group than the upper class black girls, whose families may have conformed more to the white norms of patriarchy.

They found no differences between the groups. What they did find was that all of what they called the "high-skill" girls performed below their ability when opposed to low-skill boys. And that all girls performed poorly in mixed sex groups. They also found that while high skill girls volunteered more than low-skill girls, that boys' skill level did not correlate with the number of times they would volunteer (706). That boys took more risks, and were less likely to seek approval can be observed in the following:

> The girls seemed to volunteer only if they believed they could spell the words; boys, by contrast, volunteered even when they had only a slight chance of spelling the word correctly. . . . Even laughter from the audience at gross misspelling did not deter these would-be spelling champs. (706)

One low-skill boy volunteered nine consecutive straight wrong answers! They report that both high-skill boys and high-skill girls were observed sitting tall and paying attention. "The high-skill girls sat tall and attended to task as if fully aware of their superior skill. But did not consistently volunteer first or spell the word correctly when their opponents were boys" (707).

Horner (1972) had similar findings in looking at students' performances on tests and the difference between when students worked in competitive groups with mixed sexes and when students worked alone. She found that many men did better when they worked in competition. The majority of the females, however, did better working alone, "Their performance deteriorated most noticeably in competition with men" (Weitzman 1984, 232).

What appears to be happening here is, as Leo states, that "when male behavior sets the tone for female learning females tend to lose out" (1990, 21). It may be that girls are less likely to take part in competitive activities. Or competitive and aggressive behavior may have been socialized out of female students. Homer suggests a third explanation: the traditional stereotypes (that girls should not show their intelligence and that boys are and should be smarter) still linger. A combination of all these factors probably comes into play. The lesson is that teachers need to be made aware of these differences in gender. Teachers need to realize in their planning that certain activities may encourage even more active participation by the boys above and beyond the difference in participation that is normally present. If a competitive game appears to work wonderfully because those who often cause trouble are engaged in the hidden learning of a game, one should stop and look at who participates.

I would also like to add some personal experience here on a subject that I did not find specifically in the research. This is the idea of group-building activities in the classroom. It would appear advisable that the teacher watch what kinds of groups they are building with these activities. Many group building activities focus on physical performances such as rock climbing or wall climbing. Often what happens, unless some specific attention is paid to the situation, is that men or boys end up doing the majority of the physical/helping work. In a wall-climbing activity when a female is being lifted up by males on the ground to be caught by males above, this does nothing for the female, other than reconfirm already set roles. As one MAT student writes on a wall climbing experience,

> Take into account that men were the major players in the wall activity (although women could have been) because they were the ones hauling people up. Early on they [men] were given roles of being in control and authority, and this may influence their actions later in the program. The rule should be one man, one women on top perhaps. (MAT student male)

Any group built in this manner is a group which conforms to the exact stereotypical roles found in society. Perpetuation of these roles only further hinders women's participation. Some females may find an experience such as this rewarding, particularly those who are less active, and so have a positive reaction to the overall experience of having made it through a difficult task, in whatever way possible. However for the many who do not question their ability to accomplish the task, it is how the goal is accomplished that becomes the main issue Unless gender issues and ways to avoid stereotypical patterns are first addressed, group building activities often work against the empowerment of females. All too often these issues go unaddressed. After the activity, women withhold their negative feelings for fear of the dreaded response, "Well, why didn't you just speak up when it was happening?"

If old enough, females need to understand why they may not be as able to take part in a competitive or leadership role. If the girls are young they need to be pressed to be active--not to be allowed to always assume the comfortable passive role they have been praised for and constrained by. Sensitive educators must recognize that the active role is completely out of of character and uncomfortable for some males and females.

In fact, such sensitive educators, as shown by the previous misperceptions of participation, are few. In both the present example of group building activities as well as the lack of awareness of participation patterns, great strides must be taken in increasing sensitivity to who is participating and how. Some of the consequences of all of the above issues, (expectations, attention, and participation) will be discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 9

SOME POSSIBLE CONSEQUENCES OF BIAS IN THE CLASSROOM

> When you feel peripheral in class, when your participation is not expected and your contributions are not thought to be important, it will scarcely be surprising if, when your academic achievements are minimized and your career goals are not taken seriously, you lose your self-confidence. (Martin 1990, 20)

> Self-esteem refers to regard for the self, that is, the feelings a person has about her or his worth generally. It relates to how individuals estimate their own intrinsic value. (The University of the State of New York 1989, 2)

Four components that lead to positive self-esteem follow: 1) Individuality ("I am somebody"), 2) Connections ("I belong"), 3) Power (" I am competent"), and 4) Options ("I have possibilities"). (The University of the State of New York 1989, 4). Research has long shown that self-esteem and academic achievement are linked. The ability to learn is not only dependent on intelligence, but also on self-esteem (4). "In addition teacher expectation of an individual will affect that student's performance through self-esteem" (4). Low self-esteem has been linked not only to academic failure but to a myriad of other consequences from being easily influenced by others to expressing more racial prejudice. (4).

Yet another major area in which gender bias has been found among students is in its positive correlation with the loss of self-esteem in women and girls. The AAUW surveyed 3,000 children on self-esteem. The students came from 36 public schools in grades 4-10 from throughout the U.S. in 1990. About 1/4 of those surveyed were black and Hispanic. Nancy Goldberg, an advisor to the survey concludes that "a lot of girls come to doubt their own intelligence in school" (Bower 1991, 184). Though both boys and girls suffer a loss of self-esteem in early adolescence, this drop has been found to be more extreme for girls. What makes it in part more difficult for girls is that the transition, "from 'young girl' to 'young woman' involves meeting unique demands in a culture that both idealizes and exploits the sexuality of young women while assigning them roles that are clearly less valued than male roles" (AAUW 1992a, 11).

The question the AAUW used to test self-esteem was to ask students if they are happy the way they are. They reached the following conclusions:

> Girls, aged eight and nine, are confident, assertive, and feel authoritative about themselves. They emerge from adolescence with a poor self image, constrained view of their future and their place in society, and much less confidence about themselves and their abilities. Sixty percent of elementary school girls say they are 'happy the way I am,' a core measure of personal self-esteem. More boys, 67% of those surveyed also strongly agreed with the statement. Over the next eight years, girls' self esteem falls 31 percentage points, with only 29 percent of the high school girls saying they are happy with themselves. Almost half of the high school boys (46 percent) retain their high self-esteem. (AAUW 1991, 4)

This declining sense of self may be inhibiting girls' actions and abilities. As first discussed in the Chapter 6, teachers are more likely to do things for girls and allow boys to do things themselves. Consequently, the AAUW finds "the biggest difference in self-esteem between girls and boys centers on the subject of 'doing things' " almost half the boys say they are "pretty good at a lot of things" while less than one third of the girls say this

(1991, 6). The AAUW also reports that boys are twice as likely to state their talents as what they like best about themselves. "Boys' confidence in their ability in sports, four times as high for adolescent boys as for girls, is the source of much of the difference" (AAUW 1991, 7). Girls on the other hand are twice as likely to name a physical characteristic as what they like best about themselves. They find that physical appearance is most important for middle school girls, which directly correlates with the greatest decline in self-esteem. This also relates to Elder and Parker's study of cheerleading, and the added importance that appearance takes on when in middle school such an activity is introduced.

> Boys' greater confidence in their talents, in their ability to do things, cushions their uneasiness about changes in their appearance; whereas society tells girls more strongly that their worth is dependent on their appearance. (AAUW 1991, 7)

A fairly large change in academic pride is also found between elementary and high school with the percentage of girls who say they feel pride in their school work dropping from 49 to 12%, while boys go from 53-16%. The AAUW feels that this drop is more significant for girls because they are more dependent on their academic success for self-esteem. The size of the drop for boys is equal yet not as significant because academic pride is thought to play a smaller part in boys' self-esteem, due to sports and other non-academic outlets which are more available to boys.

In looking at black girls separately, they found that black girls in elementary school have high levels of self-esteem, which they retain through high school. Janie Victoria Ward of Simmons College feels that black girls have high self-esteem because

> Black culture emphasizes independence and assertiveness. But academic self-esteem is low. There is a decline in academic pride. Black girls are not relying on schools to give them a positive image of themselves. (quoted in AAUW 1992b, 27)

Hispanic girls were found to be much less confident than black girls, though they begin with somewhat higher levels of self-esteem than white girls. Hispanic girls' personal self-esteem or confidence drops 35 points--larger than any other group (AAUW 1991, 9).

Bruce Bower (1991) argues against the some of the AAUW survey. He writes that Roberta G. Simmons of the University of Pittsburgh, who has done longitudinal studies on self-esteem , does not support the AAUW 's findings, and feels their survey was only a "snap shot" of a single point in time (139). Bower feels that girls are more sensitive to awareness of emotions which may create a "misimpression that large sex-differences exist in self-esteem" (186). Naomi Gerstel of the University of Massachusetts suggests that the AAUW results may not be as dramatic as they appear because she says the study leaves out drop outs who are more likely to be male and more likely to have lower self-esteem (185).

Bower quotes Joseph Adelson from the University of Michigan: "It's been known for some time that girls report self-esteem declines in adolescence, but the reasons for those declines are unclear." The AAUW study does not provide enough evidence to change the system. "It's inappropriate to take the correlation in this survey to politicized conclusions about educational reform" (185). This appears to be a contradiction in terms. If the drop is, as he states, a well known one, then should the place where children spend the majority of their time be ignored? In other words, given that it has been confirmed that self-esteem drops in school, it is time these results are politicized.

Another backlash to the self-esteem studies can be seen in an article in the National Review entitled "The Ladies of Mills." This issue contained a special section entitled "Rebuilding America: A Citizens Guide" which had titles such as

Enemies of Eros: How the sexual revolution is killing family, marriage and sex and what we can do about it" under its suggested reading.

> We hear a lot of talk about peoples feelings, not enough about their responsibility to buckle down and work hard, whatever they feel. Every immigrant, every member of the lower class, got slighted on the way up. That's part of the definition of being down. But millions make their way nevertheless. Demand for self-esteem come close to suggesting that it's better to feel good about yourself than to do well. (May 28, 1990, 17)

The above is an extreme point of view and is not meant to distract from meaningful critique of research. However it is important to realize the threat that studies into gender and race make on people, and to be aware that there are very negative connotations underlying some of the arguments against gender studies. This will be looked into further in Chapter 10 when the curriculum and the debates over its change are discussed.

Even if girls make it out of high school with a fair degree of confidence the following shows that the road through college may be just as difficult or even more so.

> Most of these studies point to a loss of confidence among many women in mainstream colleges. One survey of high school valedictorians for instance, showed that upon entering college, roughly equal numbers of males and females thought they were intellectually superior to their peers. But after two years of college, 22% of the males and only 4% of the females considered themselves smarter than the rest of the class. It would be nice to know why so many of our brightest females acquire self-doubt so quickly at college. (Leo 1990, 21)

Besides biases in attention, expectations and participation that may affect self-esteem in school for girls, let's look briefly at how other students may also promote negative views of girls. "The way students treat each other during school hours is an aspect of the informal learning process, which has significant implications for girls" (AAUW 1992a, 73). Reports of student to student sexual harassment of both verbal and physical types among junior high and high school students are on the rise. In almost all of the cases, it is boys harassing girls (Strauss (1988), Stein (1990) as cited in AAUW 1992a 73). Kane and Frazee (1978) found that 65% of high school females in non-traditional courses reported harassment both by male classmates and by some teachers (cited in AAUW 1992a, 44).

> When boys line up to "rate" girls as they enter a room, when boys treat girls so bad that they are reluctant to enroll in courses where they may be the only female, when boys feel it is good fun to embarrass girls to the point of tears, it is no joke. Yet these types of behaviors are often viewed by school personnel as harmless instances of "boys being boys." (AAUW 1992a, 73)

Some of the responses to my survey of what boys get in trouble for in school were the following:

- "Making fun of other people-but most of the time they take it as a joke" (elementary male, grade 4/5)
- "Making fun of or insulting" (elementary male, grade 4/5).
- "They talk out of turn and say rude remarks" (high school female).
- "Guys still think it's cool to put down girls" (high school teacher female).

The previous chapters have looked at the many negative factors which influence females from elementary school through college. The following chapter will look into another, more subtle yet equally powerful force, which like the others, may be hindering female students from reaching and holding onto their full potential in the classroom. This silent carrier of expectations, values, prejudices, etc. is the curriculum.

CHAPTER 10

BIAS IN THE CURRICULUM

> Ask most high school students who Jane Addams, Ida Tarbell or Susan B. Anthony were and you may get an answer. Ask about Margaret Sanger, Abigail Duniway, or Margaret Brent and you will probably get puzzled looks. Soujourner Truth, Frances Wright, Ana Howard Shaw, Emma Willard, Mary Bickerdyke, Maria Mitchell, Providence Crandall and scores of others sound like answers from some historians version of trivia. Interest in the fate of obscure Americans may seem an esoteric pursuit, but this is not the case. History, despite its enviable reputation for presenting the important facts about our past, is influenced by considerations other than the simple love of truth. It is an instrument of the greatest social utility, and the story of our pasts is a potent means of transmitting cultural images and stereotypes. (Trecker 1971, as quoted in Sadker and Frazier 1973, 115)

> " In twelve years of school, I never studied anything about myself." (12th grade African American girl, New York area urban high school March 1991, cited in AAUW 1992a, 61)

"In my Western Civ. class we talked about war a lot--so the boys tend to monopolize the conversation. We don't really study any females. My U.S. History class was more interesting for me because my teacher taught us about both males and females" (high school student female).

10-1:

WHAT IS TAUGHT? WHAT CHANGES HAVE OCCURRED?

Part of the AAUW's report consisted of looking at the exclusion of women from the general curriculum and the consequences of this. One possible outcome of this exclusion is the damage to the girls' self-esteem. Because of their growing sexuality and growing awareness of the innate differences between them and boys, adolescent girls may become more aware of another difference. Girls spend all day in a place which rarely addresses their personal history or accomplishments. "Lowered self-esteem is a perfectly reasonable conclusion if one has been subtly instructed that what people like oneself have done in the world has not been important and is not worth studying" (as quoted in 1992a, 67 from Kerber 1990). How are students to grow and reach their potential when no role models or mirrors are in sight? Whether lack of self reflection effects esteem, life goals, or whether or not to take that advanced math class, everyone knows the importance of "relating to", and connecting with a subject, book, author, etc. Let's now look deeper into the classroom, at the topics and text which are being covered.

> Women arrived in 1619. They held the Seneca Falls Convention on Women's Rights in 1848. During the rest of the nineteenth century they participated in reform movements, chiefly temperance, and were exploited in factories. In 1920 they were given the vote. They joined the armed forces during the Second World War and there after have enjoyed the good life in American History. (Janice Trecker 1977 as quoted in M. Sadker and D. Sadker 1985a, 64)

The curriculum is the "central message-giving instrument of the school" (AAUW 1992a, 60). The curriculum occupies the majority of students' days. "It can strengthen or decrease student motivation for engagement, effort, growth, and development through the messages it delivers to students about themselves and the world" (60). Materials which do not reflect a diverse population are warped perceptions of the world, or what the world could and should be. School has changed, as discussed in the first part of this paper. Classrooms today are populated with males and females of all colors and races, many of whom had originally been denied any education in the United States. However the main subject areas studied in schools today, the AAUW finds are, "basically the same as they were at the turn of the century" (61). Given the percentages which now make up the schools, and the fact that, "by the year 2000, only one - fifth of the work force will be native-born white males" (1992b, 16), it is well beyond the appropriate time to begin to teach about the student population being taught to. But what is it that has always been, and is still being taught?

For the past eleven years, teachers joining a faculty development project were all given a survey sponsored by Wellesley College. On the survey teachers were asked what they remembered studying about women in high school, more than half responded "nothing" (AAUW 1992a 64). Some remembered studying about a scattering of goddesses, saints and heroines. Marie Currie was found to be the only female scientist mentioned in ten years of the survey (64). "Virtually all teachers polled recall feeling a distance between their own lives and what was portrayed in the formal curriculum" (64).

During the seventies and early eighties, more inclusive curricula were added to schools, prompted by the dramatic increase of black, ethnic, and women's studies in colleges and universities. The Council on Interracial Books for Children was founded in 1966; The Feminist Press began in 1970; and the

Women's Education Equity Program was federally funded in 1974. These programs inspired many schools to diversify their curriculum to teach materials which better reflected students' lives. However, during the 1980's, the federal support for sex and race equity research and action dropped significantly (62).

> At the highest level of support in 1980, the office of Education spent only two percent of it's budget on sex equity. Subsequently, however the Reagan administration attempted unsuccessfully to reduce to 'zero budget' the two largest programs supporting race and sex equity, the Title IV programs of the Civil Rights Act and the Women's Educational Equity Act. The sense that race equity and sex equity programs figured in a federal agenda diminished. This disinvestment is reflected by the absence of sex, gender and cultural awareness in most of the national reports of the late 1980's. (AAUW 1992a, 111)

Therefore, much of the research looked at in this chapter will be from the seventies and early eighties. Though it is older research, one must realize two important points: It is this period that produced the present generation of teachers and secondly, not a whole lot has changed. In the AAUW's "Creating a Gender Fair Curriculum" (1992), they conclude that the traditional curriculum followed in schools today is largely Eurocentric and focuses mainly on white men, their work and their accomplishments. Women and minorities are still today primarily ignored.

In Sex Equity Handbook for Schools (1982), Sadker and Sadker list the following five areas as the forms which bias in the curriculum often take: 1. stereotyping, 2. imbalance or selectivity, 3. unreality such as avoidance or glossing over of issues, 4. fragmentation or isolation such as the one chapter entitled Women in History, or A Black Perspective, and 5. linguistic bias (73).

1. Stereotyping

Pearson (1985) looks at stereotyping in children's literature. She refers to a 1974 study where Oliver found that girls are "pictured as kind, attentive, and serving, while boys are pictured as adventuresome and strong" (41). Boys are said to most often be depicted as active participants while girls are passive observers. Pearson reports on Rachlin and Vogt's 1974 summary that in their words, "boys do" and "girls are" (41). "Boys are referred to by the functions they perform or the activities in which they engage while girls are known in terms of their appearance or the way they look to others" (41).

To realize how predominant this contrast between girls looking and boys doing is, one need only remember a standard mnemonic device: When children are taught to remember the musical scale, they are told that E, G, B, D and F stand for "every good boy does fine" while F, A, C, and E represent the "face," an area with which girls are obsessed.

Howe (1971) found that the stereotypical family in children's literature is made up of a mother who does not have a job outside of the home, a father who does, and older brother, a younger sister, and two pets (42). Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson and Vogel (1970) "listed male-value items in children's literature as 'aggressive, independent and adventurous,' and female traits as 'very gentle, very interested in own appearance, and a very strong need for security' " (cited in Pearson 42).

2. Imbalance and Selectivity

In the second area of bias, that of imbalance and selectivity, the Sadkers in there book Dick and Jane as Victims (1972) find many prime examples. In a survey of readers in 134 elementary schools, within 2,760 stories the following breakdown of topics was found: Boy-centered stories to girl centered stories 5:2;

male to female main characters 3:1; male to female biographies 6:1; male to female animal stories 2:1; and male to female folk or fantasy stories 4:1 (M. Sadker and D. Sadker 1982, 16). Maybe the reasons for this discrepancy in numbers is due to beliefs such as the one Sadkers uncovered in one teacher education textbook written by Rubin (1975), which states, "it has been found that boys will not read 'girl books,' whereas girls will read 'boy books' therefore the ratio of boy books should be about 2 to 1 in the classroom library collection" (quoted in M. Sadker and D. Sadker 1985a, 149).

Imbalance is also found in whose books are read. In a 1989 study of books used in high school English classes in a national sample of public, independent and Catholic schools, of the ten books most often used only one was written by a woman and none by any other minority group (AAUW 1992a, 62, from Applebee 1989). The most frequently required authors were white males. There has been " little change in overall balance from similar lists twenty five or eighty years ago" (Applebee (1989) as quoted in AAUW 62).

Lynn Bloom (1988) illustrates at length the imbalance and selectivity which continues in educational realms well beyond high school. Bloom focuses on a list put together by an English professor, E.D. Hirsch (1987), and two other white men, a historian and a physicist from the University of Virginia entitled "Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know." This list of 8000 items Hirsch says is, "intended to illustrate the character and range of the knowledge literate Americans need to share" (as quoted in Bloom 2). One hundred people, not known by name, gender, or occupation, (however one can probably make an educated guess), were consulted on and "agreed [that the list] contains the code of the dominant culture" (2). It is what Hirsch feels is the, "best that has been known and thought in the world" (as quoted in Bloom 1). With this list Bloom says Hirsch has hopes to become Webster's successor (2).

What Hirsch's cultural literacy boils down to is knowledge of a very white, mostly male world. On his list "the average is 76% references to men (almost all white, unless they're objects, such as a Big Ben, or concepts, as in Boys will be boys) to 24% (mostly white) women" (3). Bloom briefly contemplates the possibility of there being no female equal to Chaucer, Shakespeare or Milton. What then explains that the list includes as Bloom says, "Saint Francis but not Saint Teresa, Andrew Wyeth but not Georgia O'Keefe, Ralph Ellison but not Alice Walker . . . "(3). Hirsch says that the mastery of his few hundred pages of information is what stands, "between the literate and the illiterate" and "will make the difference between 'dependence and autonomy' that now exists" in our society (as quoted in Bloom 4). Hirsch argues that this white, male, western, culture is the culture of the United States, in largely the same way he argues for monolingualism which is a related but distinct issue.

While Bloom manages to consider Hirsch's motives as "benevolent" and "well-intentioned," just rather unaware that he ignores a very large portion of the United States, this can no longer be tolerated, or excused as lack of awareness. People must be made aware that, as Bloom goes on to state, no matter how "sympathetic" these elitist white men may have been to women, "they largely wrote for, by and about other elitist white men, who canonized the works and deified their authors" (9). It is this canon she states that formed the foundation of graduate education in the humanities over the past century. This canon is still being used today by many graduate departments (9).

After pointing out the fact that in 1958 the University of Michigan's doctoral reading list included 245 men, including Shakespeare's complete works, to ten white women, no blacks and no other ethnic groups (9), Bloom then asks us to look at the issue of women having only these male authors points of view to relate to. That is, people tend to write about their experiences, the trials and tribulations of their lives, or the lives of those surrounding them. That the most often read literature in school is dominated by male writers, and thought to be most important by male list makers, forces readers to "adopt male views and values" (cited in Bloom 10). Fetterley points to such books as Paradise Lost, where in the spirit of the reading it is, "unacceptable to defend that quintessential temptress Eve" (Bloom 10).

> To be excluded from a literature that claims to define one's identity is to experience a peculiar form of powerlessness--not simply the powerlessness which derives from not seeing ones own experience articulated, clarified and legitimized in art, but more significantly the powerlessness . . . [that is] the consequence of the invocation to identify as male while being reminded that to be male--to be universal--to be American--is to be *not female* . Not only does powerlessness characterize women's experience of reading, it also describes the content of what is read. (Fetterley 1978 as quoted in Bloom 1988, 3)

Bloom asks us, as does Fetterley, to contemplate the impact on women having to sympathize with Fredric Henry and not Catherine, as she dies in childbirth with Fredric's baby in Hemingway's Farewell to Arms. "What is in Milton, and Lawrence and Hemingway for women may be quite different, as Fetterley has shown for Hemingway, from what male writers and male critics find there" (11).

Consider, as Bloom does, the ways in which one studies or is engaged in learning. "My own experiences in teaching autobiography, however convinces me that men and women alike read autobiographies as analogous to their own lives ('How does this person's life resemble mine?' ' What can I lean from it?' 'What's in it for me?')" (11). Deming and Gowen (1990) also write about the importance of relating to a subject. Think about some of the following statements made by their students on what they considered to be their best essay of the term.

> I chose my essays about arguments with parents first because I like to write about experiences I am familiar with. I put my essay about young people in love second because I can relate to dating, but I really don't know anything about dating in China. (Deming and Gowen 1990, 11)

The authors tell us that the students had actually studied dating in China extensively in class. Deming and Gowen explain that the student quoted above values highly that which he can personally relate to and devalues or dismisses those things which he had only read about or discussed in class. Another woman writes the following:

> I enjoyed working on this paper the most because of the very strong feelings I have about women in not having equality with men, therefore I rank this paper number 1 (12).

A third student says, "the paper I wrote on women was hard because I can not relate to how women in America feel." If this American male has a difficult time "relating" to an American woman, think about the difficulty white women have relating to European men of a hundred years ago, or even more complex, a black woman writing on European men. These are the difficulties females have been facing since they have been allowed into the educational system. Women should have to struggle to understand men's lives. They are important, and pushing to understand always encourages growth. However, it is not acceptable that only females have to make this great leap of comprehension.

> What we know is what we teach. We must ensure that the literary canon is expanded . . . I would prefer exploded . . . to include works of high quality literature by female and male writers, not just Michigan's Big Ten but literature that extends from Sappho to Marianne Moore, Mary Wortley Montagu to Margaret Atwood to Nadine Gordimer. We must engender students' ways of reading texts, as well as the reading lists, to make them accessible to men

> and women majorities and minorities not necessarily alike, but equivalent. (Bloom, 12)

What Bloom concludes everyAmerican needs to know is that men's writings and women's writings of all races and social backgrounds, speak differently to different people at different times, (14) and that it is only in addressing and learning through all people's experiences that one can really be assured some kind of cultural literacy.

> Men as well as women need to be able to read Kate Chopin's The Awakening with understanding, men as well as women need to know why Tillie Olson's "I Stand Here Ironing" represents an appropriate subject and stance for a woman author and a woman character: men as well as women need to recognize the significance and complexity of female friendships and mother daughter relationships as portrayed not only by Jane Austen and George Elliot, but by Gertrude Stein, Gail Godwin, Maxine Kumin, and Toni Morrison. (12-13)

A new canon would include the neglected, making their experiences and different struggles visible. This inclusion of all people into what is considered superior work empowers not only the populations which it has previously left out but also brings new depth and understanding to the white male life as they come to realize that their reality has only been one of many.

3. Avoidances

The third area of inequity in the curriculum is avoidance of reality. In a 1971 study the Sadkers conducted of twelve popular U.S. history texts, they found that, " the contributions made by American women to Colonial life, the Civil War, frontier life, and the world wars were overlooked" (16). Also overlooked were "women's work on pioneer farms, the role of women in the earlier days of the labor movement, the development of birth control and it's impact on the American family" (16), and not surprisingly, there is no mention of issues of sex discrimination. To demonstrate how lightly the need for inclusion is considered, take the following case: In a New York Long Island school district centerfold was placed by male teachers over a Women's History Week poster (Shakeshaft 1986, 501). Apparently, this ignorance of reality in history is more than just a passive disregard. It appears to be an active campaign against diversity.

4. Fragmentation and Isolation

Fragmentation and isolation today often get by as inclusion, such as history books which include a single chapter on women. Actually, the whole idea of a Women's Studies Department and Ethnic Studies shows clearly the separation and isolation of particular groups, almost any groups, from that which is not male and white. Women's Studies departments refer us to the issue of the paradox. Such departments are necessary to place women's issues as the priority and help one to see clearly the vast exclusion that exists in traditional departments. Nevertheless, in a gender-fair world Women's Studies Departments would not exist. On the one hand, the new interest and dedication that women have in making sure their lives are not ignored is shown. On the other hand, they serve as a blatant symbol that a problem does exist. Can one imagine, for example, the need for a course named, White Male Writers of the Nineteenth Century, or maybe Men in Science?

At the textbook level fragmentation and isolation is alive and well also. Women and minorities are depicted only in interaction amongst themselves having none or little impact on society as a whole (M.Sadker and D. Sadker 1982, 70).

> For example textbook discussions of feminism often talk about how woman are affected by this contemporary movement; typically there is little analysis of the impact of the women's movement on other groups and social issues. Such treatment of women and minorities in textbook implies that their history, their experiences,

> and their contributions are insignificant to the development of contemporary society. (70)

5. Linguistic Bias

Of the five areas just examined, linguistic bias seems to be the one which is improving most quickly. This may be because bias in language is so easily recognizable. However, although many know that it is correct to use gender neutral pronouns, they fail to grasp the importance of the issue's roots. In personal conversations in my own MAT class, I was shocked to find this ignorance in some male classmates. It seemed particularly odd that in a program where language is shown to be a strong carrier of culture and values that some people would still disregard the power to be gained by changing language. Perhaps they did realize the power.

The Sadkers give means by which to better understand and explain the issue to those who are still not convinced of the bias which masculine pronouns hold. An exercise the Sadkers suggest is to ask students to draw cavemen. Most often children will do as told and draw men. Then ask another group to draw cave people, students are then most likely to draw men women and children. They concluded that

> In short, masculine pronouns such as he and his are not as generic as we once thought. When children hear or read them, they may not form images of all people. Rather, they take the term literally; when they read he and man, they think male. (1982, 71)

Another test is to picture first in one's own mind, "the pioneer and his wife, children, and cattle moved West" and then "the pioneer family moved West" (72). Numerous other studies have been done on this issue including experiments with job ads and fictional stories. All provided evidence that masculine pronouns are exactly that. When a masculine pronoun is used, a male usually comes to mind.

In a time when the world is more diverse than ever, and women make up more than fifty percent of graduate students, what are some of the recent conclusions on the changing of bias in the classroom between the seventies and today? The Sadkers concluded that language in textbooks today is not as sexist but that the numbers of stories based on men has actually increased. They found ethnic men to have made the largest gains while minority females are still "almost non- existent" (M.Sadker and D. Sadker 1982, 86). The AAUW concludes that while there has been a decrease of sexism in text, "omission, tokenism, and gender stereotyping still occur frequently in textbook references to girls and women" (1992a, 60). They also found that in 138 articles on reform in education between 1983 and 1987, "less than one percent of the texts addressed sex equity" (61, on work of Sadker and Sadker 1989, Tetrault and Schmuck 1985). And in a 1990 survey commissioned by the National Education Association, it was found that even within programs organized and sponsored by institutions with concerns of equity in education, "only three national professional development programs for teachers focused on gender and race in English and social studies curriculum content" (61, from K. Bogart 1992).

While textbooks today do have guidelines for non-sexist language, not all authors follow them (cited in 1992a, 62). Though there is observable change in texts (especially in history books, women are more likely to be included), they are still likely to only be the "famous women," "or women in protest movements." Tetrault (1987) found that rarely is there "dual and balanced treatment of women and men, and seldom are women's perspectives and cultures presented on their own terms" (cited in AAUW 1992a, 62). At a 1990, conference, researchers reported that textbooks which were written under current California guidelines for gender and race equity still showed "subtle language bias, neglect of scholarship of women, omission of women as developers of history and initiators of events and absence of women from accounts of technological developments," (62, National Council for Social Studies 1990). In addition, programs were not receiving the money and support they had been. Arthur Applebee (1986) writes that, "twenty years of consciousness raising and resource development have not changed the basic curriculum because teachers have not had the time and support to familiarize themselves with the new materials" (cited in AAUW 1992a 66). Teacher education in gender issues will be addressed in Chapter 12. However in the following parts of this chapter the more negative factors withholding curriculum change in addition to the lack of teacher time and support will be looked at.

10-2 :

BUT THERE WEREN'T ANY WOMEN IN THOSE FIELDS

When it appears so obvious that re-thinking the curriculum is the only way to make education excellent and equitable for both boys and girls why then is the process such a slow one? Before addressing the debates over curriculum change, it's important to clarify another issue within gender studies so that one has a response to the following thought: The curriculum does not include women because they were just not a part of the things considered important.

Not only do people need to be aware of and educated in where women have made known contributions to society, but furthermore to come to a more complete understanding we need also look at where there appears to have been no contribution by women, and what that means. It is said that there is no equal to Shakespeare and Chaucer; that there are just not as many women's voices throughout history. Within this concept lies a deeper question: Is there really an absence of women like Shakespeare due to restrictions in society on women? Or has education throughout the history of Western Civilization failed to create a gender-fair curriculum? In other words, which came first, the lack of a quality curriculum or the imagined lack of women's contributions? Warren (1988), in her writing, "The Absence of Women from the History of Rhetoric: Exclusion or Omission," we observe an educator and scholar as she struggles with this concept,

> I lament the task of speaking about a silence I cannot break. . . . That silence haunts me as I teach my students the history of rhetoric and preach the connections between expression and personal excellence, public discourse and democracy, rhetoric and humanity. It tortures me as I scrutinize to append to the great volume of cultural lore a small footnote concerning women. The footnote is always pathetic. Women had no voice in the polis of ancient Greece. (2)

This dichotomy that Warren points to compels many other scholars as well. A need for a deeper understanding of the absence of women from history exerts itself upon these scholars:

> We need to ask important and intricate questions about the origins and consequences of their absence. We need to understand the absence in ways that shape an astute appreciation of it and guide meaningful intellectual or critical conduct. More than merely remarking upon the absence, we need ways to address it. (3)

Exclusion, Warren decides, is the uglier of the two concepts. Exclusion means that women were denied rights by which to be involved in a variety of activities, mainly of the intellectual or athletic type.

> The exclusion is anchored in various rationales about women's intellectual or physical inferiority or, perversely, in claims of women's superior moral judgment or crucial social function (as mothers or hearth tenders) which would be imperiled if women ventured out of their 'places'. (Warren 3)

The absence of women through omission on the other hand has a somewhat brighter, though still infuriating definition. We can view the omission of women as "an oversight attributable to the misogyny of Western Culture and particularly to those who chronicle it" (3). This type is that which we see occurring in texts such as U.S. history ones today. Absence of women due to omission is changeable: "Once the misogynist distortion is corrected, we see clearly how women 'were there' as a force in history" (3).

Again we see a paradox of necessary options. Warren speaks specifically on the topic of rhetoric; however, her resolution to the paradox is one that is useful to keep in mind when thinking about and speaking on the absence of women in any area.

> We must address the absence of women from the history of rhetoric as **both** an exclusion **and** omission, considering how these two stand in relation to each other. An over-emphasis on exclusion only perpetuates it, depriving women of the 'lift' necessary to break their silence. A recasting of absence as omission opens up new possibilities for visions and inventions which rise above our conception of rhetoric past and present, but these may elude us if not tethered to the ground where we stand, often in silence. (17)

10-3:

THE BATTLE OVER THE CURRICULUM

We have discussed the bias of the past and present curriculum; we have considered who students are today and realized that this curriculum no longer fits or addresses students who fill U.S. classrooms; finally, we have considered some of the reasons curricula may be biased. Let's view for a moment the effects a more diverse curriculum has had on students before exploring the current battle over the idea of a new and diversified program of study.

Campbell and Wirtenberg (1986), in "How Books Influence Children: What the Research Shows," put together twenty three studies supporting the belief that books do influence and transmit values to children (cited in AAUW 1992a 62). The studies show that "multicultural reading produce markedly more favorable attitudes towards non-dominant groups than do all-white curricula, that academic achievement for all students was positively correlated with use of non sexist and multicultural curriculum materials, and that sex-role stereotyping was reduced in those students whose curriculum portrayed females and males in non-stereotypical roles (62).

They also report that in a 1985 review by Scott and Schau of more than 100 research studies it was found that: " Pupils who are exposed to sex-equitable materials are more likely than others to 1) have gender balanced knowledge of people in society, 2) develop more flexible attitudes and more accurate sex-role knowledge, and 3) imitate role behaviors contained in the material . . . The evidence is strong in support of using these materials to improve the learning experience of both males and females" (cited in AAUW 1992a, 65).

So what then obstructs developing and using new materials that better suit the needs of all students? Many view the old curriculum as the one and only truth. They believe that changing the curriculum to include all women sacrifices space from the real history, the important history. As with Hirsch,

> Critics of the new scholarship maintain that the traditional Eurocentric scholarship and curriculum represent the 'objective truth' about our society and that this 'truth' has been corrupted by the efforts of minorities and women to forge a more inclusive curriculum. (AAUW 1992c, 4)

In November 1989 the following advertisement entitled "Is the Curriculum Biased" appeared in the "Chronicle of Higher Education."

> The National Association of Scholars is in favor of ethnic studies, the study of non-Western cultures, and the special problems of women and minorities in our society, but it opposes subordinating entire humanities and social science curricula to such studies and it views with alarm their growing politicization. Efforts purportedly made to introduce 'other points of view' and 'pluralism' often seem in fact designed to restrict attention to a narrow set of issues, tendentiously defined. An examination of many women's studies courses and minority studies courses and programs discloses little of other cultures and more excoriation of our society for it's alleged oppression of women, blacks, and others. The banner of 'cultural diversity' is apparently being raised by some whose paramount interest actually lies in attacking the West and it's institutions. (as quoted in Butler and Schmitz 1992)

This raises the pressing question: Do women's studies and ethnic studies really only educate students in a narrow and biased perspective? Are they really somehow rooted in an evil plan (as the above would have us believe)? How could this be the case when "ethnic and women's studies place at the center of inquiry populations constituting more than three-quarters of the world's population" (Butler and Schmitz 1992, 39). The threat, and it is a threat, seems to come in that women's and ethnic departments challenge the whole canon of what was once believed to be the real truth, the real knowledge, designed and taught by a specific group for a specific group. This group is no longer, if it ever was the majority.

However, embarking on a new way of thought, a new inclusion to an old system of looking at life, does bring challenge and change. New ways of viewing the past, present and future, can feel at first uncomfortable. More importantly though, and what seems to be at the root of the debate is not just the slightly uncomfortable and unfamiliar feeling involved in change itself (the internal battle of "but we've always read Shakespeare as the first text"), but rather that this re-structured way of looking at the past threatens the entire power system on which this country has been built. The assumption that white men have found, developed, and mastered this new land single-handedly, thereby providing them with superior rights and privileges is loudly challenged by the new curricula, and has in its essence the ability to empower the real majority. "A focus on women does not negate the experience of men, it only looks at it from a different standpoint. What people fear, however, is the analysis of difference in relation to power, which implies, taken to it's conclusion, restructuring or abandoning existing hierarchies" (39).

And fear there is. Questions of curricula change create as much if not more conflict than cuts in sports and art programs have. A New York City Committee of Education put together a creating committee to develop a new social studies curriculum. The report developed by the committee recommended that "curriculum and teaching methods be more inclusive and respectful of diversity" (State of NY Education Department 1991 as cited in AAUW 1992a, 67).

> The report has created a furor in the New York media, reflecting larger debates going on throughout the country. Critics have called

> ethnic studies and women's studies 'political,' as if a curriculum which leaves women out altogether is not also 'political.' Multicultural work has been termed 'divisive' without recognizing that an exclusively white male curriculum is divisive when it ignores the contributions others make to society. Critics who insist that students must focus on our 'common heritage' appear to overlook the experiences of Native American as well as the migrant history of the rest of the population, which makes diversity one of the they elements of the 'common' heritage of the United States. In a democracy, schools must address the educational need of all students. Each student should find herself or himself reflected in the curriculum. When this happens students learn and grow. (67)

In contrast to this, the following voice represents the threatened white male, the defensive, cornered power holder who realizes the threat to his basis of power:

> Instead of the Eurocentric curriculum, we are getting Afrocentric and gynocentric curricula. New York state has undertaken a revision of it's secondary-school curriculum to emphasize the contributions of 'minorities' to American culture. The desperate hope is to improve the academic performance of minorities--meaning blacks and Hispanics. According to a New York state curriculum guide, this result is to be brought about by, for example, telling minorities that the Iroquois Indians contributed to the political theory of the U.S. Constitution. That's right--lies will make us free. (National Review 1990, 39)

Not only does the above author completely refuse the possibility that history is anything other than what his history text taught him, he also attempts to foster racism. He claims that the curriculum change is to benefit a small group who are not performing well in school. He suggests that your child (if it happens to be a white boy) is going to be denied a real education because we have these other pitiful kids here who are not flourishing. It is an attempt to play on one's unaware defense system. Would he rather ignore the needs of "different" children--i.e. non-white Christian males?

The author goes on to define the new curriculum as a "free-flowing, roll your own, minorityolatrous, gynocratic educational kakistocracy (a useful word these days, meaning 'the rule of the worst')" (39). He attacks the idea of teaching students how to think because, "in order to think you have to have something to think about" (39), and praises the Japanese for what he calls their Eurocentric education. His conclusion is that the Japanese "know, as we are in the process of forgetting that when you want to harness the atom you do not consult Confucians. Great imitators, the Japanese may just save Western culture when we have forgotten who we are" (39).

Though obviously this author states an extreme case, the only difference between him and many educators is the directness of the expression of his ideas. With a different emphasis, yet just as disturbing, is an article by Christina Sommers (1990). Here we see someone else writing strongly against curriculum change. Portions of the work having been published recently in Public Affairs Quarterly and the Chronicle of Higher Education. The article is introduced as a response to the academys having become increasingly "politicized" over the past thirty years. Again we hear the language of the challenging of the real " truths." The reviewer writes that Sommers' article will be on, "the overemphasis on questions of race, class, and gender are threatening to obscure larger truths which, in the words of last month's Imprimis author Lynne V. Chenny, speaks out all people in all places at all times" (1). Sommers speaks as a woman who has completely bought into a system, and can not, or refuses to see, life existing in any other way than as it has been sold to her.

After having read so much about curriculum, what is in it, and how it affects people, it is particularly disturbing to read Sommers' point of view on it. She writes, "how is it that such a fusty and reputedly 'dry' subject as the curriculum has become the center of so much controversy?" (1). It seems ironic that an educator can be so blind to the importance of the curriculum. And if she sees the issue as unimportant, then how does she become so passionate about changing it?

She goes on to make it clear that she feels there is no truth involved in the charge that the standard curriculum is sexist, racist, or a promoter of injustice. She challenges the assumption that, "an oppressive elite has dominated Western history and culture and determined the curriculum of higher learning" (1), and likewise challenges the assumption that changing the curriculum, would liberate the oppressed. She decries any change in the present curriculum. This is the one which "tells the story of Western development through history, literature, philosophy, art and science " (1). The use of the term "the story" is worthy of note. In all of the arguments against change there is an inability to see the traditional curriculum not as **the** story but **a** story--and the failure to perceive that the West is but one part of the world. History, any history, is but a story, one story.

Professor Sommers goes on to charge that "the radical feminist role in transforming the college curriculum is only a prelude to abandoning all gender distinctions" (Intro.) As with the National Review article, we see that Sommers tries to set up a divisive mentality whereby she tells us that, "gender feminists share an ideal of a genderless culture and reject family, marriage, and maternal responsibility for child rearing" (2). It seems unlikely that including women in the curriculum would really bring all of these values and structural changes. And if this kind of change would occur, then we may have found the reason for the original exclusion.

Sommers seems to feel that an inclusive curriculum threatens the whole family structure as it is known. If someone is so certain of a way of life which is the best and right, why would they think anything would disrupt that? Why would a change in curriculum feel so threatening? It seems she has decided that it is better to play by the present and known rules, however uncomfortable they are. For as a white professional woman, this role stills brings her many advantages and privileges. Through a continuation of the status quo women of this ilk avoid confrontation and thereby gain approval.

What is particularly disturbing is that this educator seems to tell us in the following quote that it is better to not think and be content than to challenge ideas, and come to ones own conclusions about them, conclusions which may create the need to change one's life. The role of an educator is generally seen to encourage thinking. Sommers is saying here that oppression does exist, so why make oneself miserable by knowing about it.

> Feminist teaching exacts a human cost. The student who has had her consciousness 'raised' in the classroom may feel intolerably oppressed by living within the 'patriarchal' family and thus may also be burdened with a harmful personal philosophy. She may choose on ideological grounds not to marry and later find herself betrayed by that ideology. Or if she does marry, she may find it necessary to dissolve the family, no matter what the consequences for her spouse, herself, or her children. When the personal is political human relationships become fragile. (3)

What Sommers claims to be fighting for is the idea that "in purging the traditional curriculum of its supposed masculine bias the value of higher learning in America will be profoundly diminished" (4). However, what she is actually saying is anything but that. What Sommers and many of the others are fighting for is not the education of students, for if the education of students were of main concern, then filling the curriculum with ideas of both new and old which stimulate thinking would be of primary importance. What Sommers is fighting for, under the guise of what she calls a dry subject, is the status quo. It is this maintenance of the status quo which is at the bottom of many of the arguments against curriculum change. To realize this is one of the main concerns of my paper.

Sommers concludes her writing with the idea that what she calls gender feminism is not reasoned scholarship.

> It's doctrinal and political, and without grassroots support. And it is high time to challenge it in and outside the classroom. The current debate over the traditional curriculum offers us a good place to start. (4)

It is this idea of the political which is important for the reader to leave this chapter with. Whenever thinking about the curriculum and developing our own sense of what does and what does not seem important for all people, the following by Butler and Schmitz is most important to keep in mind,

> All choices are political. Why is choosing to put something in the curriculum more political than choosing to leave it out? What is left out forms one pattern. What we choose to include forms another. (1992, 39)

PART THREE

SOME IDEAS FOR CHANGE

CHAPTER 11

GIRL'S SCHOOLS, WOMEN'S COLLEGES

> It is unwise to suggest that gender bias within co-educational college is somehow intrinsic to those institutions. Gender bias comes from deeper attitudes that simply have been incorporated into the institutions. Partly because many colleges for women were founded when women were excluded from existing college for men, women's colleges have been more conscious of such attitudes. But it's inappropriate to suggest that co-educational institutions automatically treat women as second class citizens. (Hartman 1990, 40)

Again we are hit with a paradoxical situation. As with the debates over schools which were separated by race, there are two sides of the argument, both of them correct. The paradox of issues of gender reoccurs. Yes, the goal is to treat everyone as equals with integrated and equitable education being the master product. But what if we are not yet there? What happens then? On the one hand co-educational schools should be the ideal. If we really want everyone to be taught the same, given the same options, then everyone needs to be in the same place. Yet the power in receiving an equitable education comes from experiencing a bias-free environment. It is only this environment which allows people to reach their full potential. In experiencing an environment without "isms" students can see how the inclusion of these factors have affected their learning in the past. In experiencing an equitable situation, students become very aware of inequitable situations when, in the future, they may confront them. If one has never experienced a truly equitable situation, how does one know when recognize this? Yes co-education is the ideal, but if a school is sexist in any way then is the student not better off in a single-sex setting? Maybe the environment is not a "real" one, but it is possible that until equal treatment can be given it may be a solution.

> I also recommend that every woman include at least one women's college among the institutions she investigates. The mainstream institutions have more of a "real world" atmosphere. But since that is so, it is worth considering at least one institution with an environment that is counter-cultural. Such environments, presenting controlled, temporary and yes, artificial alternatives to the real world, are the very places where women together can more readily envision and then create alternative perspectives and programs to build a more livable and whole world for women and men alike. (Hartman 1990, 40)

Having attended a women's college, I feel that the situation, no matter how artificial, was a necessary one, and one that was irreplaceable in terms of being in a place, for the first time ever, where gender was not an issue, where sexism was at it's lowest possible level. To be in that situation allows people to really see how sexism effects them in all other realms of life. I believe that for any person who has suffered oppression, to live for a period of time, in a free situation, will change one's life forever.

However, the point of this chapter is not to sell the reader on single-sexed schools. The reason single-sexed schools are being addressed here in the chapter for change is that is that women and girls have repeatedly proved to thrive in single-sex environments. The motivation for this chapter comes from the desire to make those who are not aware of the benefits single-sexed schools have for females aware of them. Also, there is no better argument for the bias within co-educational schools, than one that shows greater success of females in an all female environment. In recognizing why women's schools work for women, maybe a key will be found in how co-educational schools can change to better meet the needs of half their student body.

Much of the research in this chapter is very recent and inspired by the attempted change of Mills College after 138 of existence as a women's college, to a coeducational institute. Mills did change briefly but met with such uproar, that it decided to go back to it's original form. The focus on Mills brought the issue of women's colleges into the limelight in 1990. The women of Mills and other women's schools with,

> Spirited exchanges and passionate commitment showed the world that what they appreciate first about women's colleges is the empowerment they experience in institutions that place women students at the center of their educational mission. (Hartman 1990, 40)

In "Women's Colleges and Coed Colleges: is There a Difference for Women?" Smith (1990) sets out to re-investigate a number of previous studies on this topic. One of the previous studies included in this review is "Four Critical Years" (Astin 1977). Astin, in response to many schools going co-ed for marketing reasons, rebukes their disregard of his and other's research which found that women who attended women's colleges were: "(1) more satisfied with most aspects of the experience (with the exception of social life): (2) persisted more; and (3) were more likely to attend graduate school" (cited in Smith 1990, 181). Tidball (1973) found that "graduates of women's colleges are much more likely to be represented in 'Who's Who?' than graduates of other institutions" and that this was true of all women's colleges not just the most selective (cited in Smith 181). The Women's College Coalition found in "A Study of the Learning Environment at

Women's Colleges" (1981) that "large portions of women who choose non-traditional careers and go on to graduate study" are from women's colleges (cited in Smith 182). Smith's results support the hypothesis that,

> Women's colleges relate positively to a variety of measures of student satisfaction, perceived changes in skill and abilities and educational aspirations and educational attainment. . . . students are also more likely to earn the degrees; sixty five percent form women's colleges earned the degree compared with fifty percent from co-ed schools. (191)

Only in satisfaction of social life did they find co-ed students to be more content. "These findings are similar to Astin's earlier work, even though the times and circumstances of women's colleges have changed dramatically" (191).

As if those findings are not enough to make one wonder what goes on in women's colleges, Hartman continues the praise with the findings that graduates of women's colleges are twice as likely to earn doctoral degrees than women educated in a co-ed setting. Graduates of women's colleges also:

> Made up forty two percent of the women members of the last Congress; they graduated fifteen of the fifty leading corporate women cited in an article in Business Week, even though they accounted for only five percent of all college-educated women in the relevant age group. (Hartman 1990, 40)

Hartman reminds readers though that it is not only the product we need to look at, but the process. Factors which may inhibit women's growth in co-ed schools are numerous. Besides all the issues previously discussed in this work, Hartman states that even though the co-ed classroom is more egalitarian than the world outside of school

> Women continue to be seen as less serious students. Women are less likely to find academic and career mentors than men. They receive fewer internships, fewer positions in research laboratories, fewer awards and scholarships, and fewer inside job tips. (Hartman 1990, 40)

Removal of these issues in women's colleges would obviously be felt strongly. What are some of the other aspects of women's schools which have been found to be beneficial?

Leo (1990) feels that one reason that women "learn more, learn faster, and emerge more confident at women's colleges than at co-ed colleges" (21), is that there is less sexual distraction. This is often used as the only excuse for women performing better at these institutions and it may indeed be part of the reason. However, as Leo states, what seems to be more important is the, "larger number of female teachers, who serve as mentors and role models" (21). Smith too cites the importance of women role models that are often associated with women's colleges (1990, 182).

Peer support and interaction with a faculty that is supportive is a characteristic common to women's colleges, and, Smith says, is one noted by students as very important. In evaluating women's colleges, students vote "most positively on measures having to do with the academic program of the institution and the contact with faculty and administration, as well as on perceived changes in values of tolerance and cultural awareness" (192).

Perhaps most enlightening is the importance that Smith finds women's college students place on "involvement--particularly academic involvement in and out of class" (193). Women are forced to assume the active role, for no one else can volunteer before them. Maybe this is the key. Women are not allowed in a single sex environment to take on the passive role, that has been so conditioned. Finally, women become aware of the many instances in which they have been and still remain passive.

It is important to note that single-sexed schools for boys have been found to be neither necessary nor beneficial. "Academically, boys do equally well in single-sexed and coeducation schools" (Shakeshaft 1986, 500). Because boys are not usually the recipients of negative bias, their education can only be enhanced by the inclusion of girls. This difference in male and female reaction to single-sexed environments is reflected in two answers given by MAT students when asked if they had ever attempted or taught at a single sexed institution:

> "Yes, male, Almost all my elementary and high schooling was at one so it's difficult to compare. But since high school I've found that variety in a classroom inc. gender, nationality, age enhances things." (MAT student male)

> "Yes, all-female. I found it very conducive to learning--there were no distractions--one was there to learn and study and that's what we did. Also, there were few discipline problems which made the environment a bit more positive and a lot was filled in the time we had." (MAT student female)

While boys benefit from the amount of attention gained by "acting up," girls suffer. Not only do they receive less attention but also they endure wasted class time due to hours spent on disciplinary matters.

> "Classes with a critical mass of boys are usually 'slower' and less 'productive'" (high school teacher female).

> "More girls usually equal mellower time. Less noise, more on track, less disputes. But more social disputes" (elementary teacher male).

Single-sexed schools can of course also have their down side. Many of the women's colleges in the U.S. have at their roots a strong commitment to women. They are places which have recognized inequity in education and try to bridge that gap. Often, they are based on feminist ideals--striving for equal representation in all areas of the academic life, including faculty and curriculum. Where danger can come in is the same place as where the debate comes into play against racially segregated schools. For both these types of schools, trouble arises when the segregation does not act as a counter cultural element, but only furthers the existing attitudes in the outside world by giving those in them an inferior education. The following is a statement about a school in Japan. But it could just as easily have occurred anywhere in the world. The respondent refers to her work in an all-girls school.

> "Yes--Female--In Japan. I found the atmosphere less conducive to learning. In Japan, girls schools rate low in status (generally). Students aren't thought to be serious, rather, they are hanging out until graduation. They were treated accordingly--lots of electives, field trips, etc. and little 'nitty-gritty'. Required classes like flower decoration, tea ceremony etc. Weird rules--i.e.: hair length etc. I found students to be pretty uninterested in things outside of their daily lives. (This is a general--there were many many exceptions. I don't know how the same girls would behave if there were boys around. Maybe the expectations placed upon them would be higher--It was kind of like teachers expectations were so low and the students sunk to them." (MAT student female).

So how do we begin to make all schools more like the good women's and girl's schools? The very first step is in making teachers aware that presently they fall short of the ideal.

CHAPTER 12

TEACHER TRAINING

> While it is essential that undergraduate courses be retooled to produce non-sexist teachers, it is equally important to address the issue in graduate courses so that the next generation of teacher educators can begin its reeducation. . . . To deny that responsibility is to continue to be part of the problem. (Lather 1981, 39)

When the MAT students were asked if they thought gender issues should be addressed in teacher education, 82% responded affirmatively.

"Yes, It's an issue in our society, of course it would carry over to the classroom. I feel that all too often classrooms are thought of as isolated--separate from the outside world. But really they are reflexive of what is going on in the outside world." (MAT student female)

"Absolutely! At a young age girls need to be encouraged and inspired to think and solve problems. When working with adults, teachers need to understand why their women students do not have these skills and work to 'deprogram them.'" (MAT student female)

"Yes! because I'm a woman and we get a second class education. We should have the same educational opportunities as men, and learn about the history and contributions of women and use non-sexist material." (MAT student female)

Educating teachers on all of the previous issues is one very obvious and important way to begin to make the classroom a place where all students can explore, speak out, and reach their own personal potential. Lather quotes Howe (1973) that "of all the means for implementing change, I would place priority on the education of teachers, both male and female. . . . When teachers change so does everything in their classrooms" (cited in Lather 37).

In 1979 the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education revised its standards to include a commitment to multiculturalism. Sex equity is seen as part of this new commitment. In the first of four new standards, "Multicultural education could include but not be limited to experiences which . . . [promote] analytical and evaluative abilities to confront issues such as participatory democracy, racism and sexism and the party of power" (as quoted in M. Sadker and D. Sadker 1982, 150). Yet, the situation has hardly changed.

> For most educators and non educators alike, sex equity is not usually considered part of multicultural education. While sex equity is related to multicultural education, most people consider it a distinct issue with special implications for teacher training programs. (151)

The other problem is that sex equity education is presented only as an option. This law states that sexism "could" be addressed, as could a lot of other issues of equal importance. If an education program includes a class on minority studies it will pass the standard. So, the question is, how often is sexism addressed?

The Sadkers, in their study into "The Treatment of Sex Equity in Teacher Education" (1985), estimated that among 175,000 teachers certified each year the majority have only limited knowledge of sex bias in schools and have been taught few if any skills to work with on the problem (153).

Lather (1981) finds that, "in most schools and departments of education the overwhelming perception is that sexism is of peripheral concern. As a result, little research is conducted on the issue of sex equity and teacher education" (cited in Sadker and Sadker 1985, 147). The Sadkers report that in looking in the ERIC system under general teacher education, of 15,782 titles between 1978-1981 only one half of 1% of the titles represented equity or discrimination (147). Florence Howe (1973), found that in 1,200 women's studies courses offered at colleges and universities, less than ten of these were taught in departments or schools of education (cited in Sadker and Sadker 1985, 146). And, in 1975, McCune and Mathews found there to be "forty three times as many women's studies courses taught in other departments of this nation's post secondary institutions" than in education departments (cited in Sadker and Sadker 146). The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education noted at this same time that any exposure to courses on sex equity usually occurs outside of the education department and as an elective (146, from Gollnick 1979).

> In 1979 Howe surveyed women's studies programs and courses nationally and concluded that schools of education 'were, among the most resistant to the impact of the women's movement.' Recently, Patti Lather (1982) has begun to update the McCune and Mathews listings of women's studies courses and is finding that while there are some few but notable efforts both to reform existing courses and to create separate courses with sex equity perspectives, such efforts in no way reflect institutionalized commitment to sex equity in teacher education. Rather, such efforts have depended upon the initiative of individual teacher educators who, as often as not, battle the resistance of students, peers and administrators in their efforts to bring sex equity into teacher education. (146)

The Sadkers refer to studies by Tobias (1978) and Howe (1973), to explain this lack of awareness within education departments. They found that women's studies courses are most often brought about by the demand for them by female students and professors. Yet, "political activism is less common among students in schools of education than among students in other academic departments" (146). More recently, Antonucci (1980) and Lather (1981), found, "limited awareness and aspiration of education students" and so feel the responsibility to fully educate students to the political issues of education lies within the education faculty (cited in Sadker and Sadker 146).

That education students have little awareness of the issues of sex equity, and that departments are not at the cutting edge of providing information on the subject should come as no surprise. For within such a department which is so highly dominated by females, we still find that while one-third of the teaching faculty are female less than 15% of chairs or deans are female and a full three-quarters of the tenured faculty are male. (Sadker 146, ref to Gollnick 1979). While the figures have improved slightly since that study, educational administrators are still largely male.

> " . . . I think there should be a balance between administration and classroom but there isn't and there won't ever be" (MAT student female).

Perhaps the barely perceptible rate of change promotes cynicism of this sort. Or perhaps attitudes like the above slow the rate of change.

As in the case of the elementary and high school texts discussed in Chapter 10, so too does teacher education material appear to be biased towards males. In Beyond Pictures and Pronouns: Sexism in Teacher Education Textbooks (1980), the Sadkers report on their study of 24 teacher text written between 1973-1978. They found that all but one gave less than 1% of book space to issues of sex equity (2). None gave resources or strategies to counteract sexism in the classroom. In "Introduction to Education" texts they found that over five times the content space was allocated to males, and none mentioned women in the history of education. While all four mentioned Horace Mann, none named Emma Willard. One mentioned Vergerius but not Maria Montessori (7). None mentioned that women were denied education for the first half of the history of the United States.

> Foundations of education books usually include a section on the history of education. Typically they discuss those philosophers and practitioners who have made notable contributions. One would assume that in a field like education, which has relied and still relies so much on the work of women, there would be plenty of discussion given over to women's experiences and contributions. Not so.
>
> Van Til's Education: A Beginning includes a chapter called 'What's a School For?' Here we learn about the works of those who have contributed to education. There are sections on Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Comenius, Rosseau, Pestalozzi, Herbart, Frobel, Parker, Kilpatrick, Counts, Bode and Dewey. Only white males are mentioned. Richey's Planning for Teaching includes a chapter called "The Development of Modern Concepts of Education." We learn about many of the men cited above. We learn about other men as well: Vergerius, Locke, James, Bagley, Conant, Hutchins, Bruner, Piaget, Gagne and Bloom. Emma Willard is not mentioned. Catherine Beecher is not mentioned. Sylvia Ashton Warner is not mentioned. Maria Montessori is not mentioned. (12)

They go on to name bias in just about every type of teacher education text, concluding that, "This study indicates that our teacher education textbooks are more likely to reinforce than reduce sexist attitudes and behaviors" (Preface).

Jane Martin (1984) gives a very interesting view into how women have been excluded from the whole area of educational philosophy, both in their own contributions and at the roots of theory. Martin takes us back to two of the greatest educational philosophers of the Western world, Plato and Rousseau, both of whose texts are described at length in the history of education. Martin states that standard anthologies all include portions of the Republic and Emile.

> The theories of Plato and Rosseau on the education of girls and women, however, are neglected. Many text and anthologies omit all reference to the Republic book V and those which mention Plato's views on women do so in passing or with significant distortion. Similarly, the text and anthologies either ignore Sophie altogether or treat Rosseau's discussion on her education as some kind of aberration. (Martin 1984, 32)

Yet it is in Book V of the Republic that Plato "argues that women as well as men can be rulers of the 'Just State' " and therefore need identical education. For this reason he makes the "radical proposal that the female guardians of the state be given the same education as their male counter parts, indeed that the two sexes be educated together" (31). Book V of Emile is where Rosseau gives us Sophie as representation of Everygirl (31). Rosseau argues for separate and different education for males and females.

Like the Sadkers, Martin also brings up the topic of theoretical writing and the issue that much of educational theory written by women has been overlooked. Of the text and anthologies of the field, she states "there is no mention of Catherine Macauley's Letters on Education (1974), Mary Wollstonecraft's A Vindication of the Rights of Women (1967), or Catherine Beecher's A Treatise on Domestic Economy (1977). Furthermore, she says Maria Montessori's theoretical work on the education of children is discussed by very few other than Rusk (1965).

Martin's explanation for the exclusion of women from the history of educational thought is that often the women's stories take place outside of the traditional educational and philosophical realm. That is, women's writing and work has historically occupied the sector which is private and reproductive rather than public and productive. Western thought makes that which is public and productive the only important matters in intellectual thought.

The omission of all of these women and writings on women such as Plato's "Guardians" is a great loss. Martin feels the greatest loss is that "both sexes are thereby denied the opportunity to understand and evaluate the range of ideals that the great educational thinkers of the past have held up for women" (33). Martin feels this disregard puts us at risk of repeating mistakes and never reaching "adequate ideals" (32).

> Even historical views like Rousseau's, that seem most inimical to the interests of women need to be studied for the kernels of truth they may contain. Even theories like Plato's and Wollstonecraft's that seem most consonant with women's goals today need to be subjected to critical analysis lest there problematic aspects be incorporated into our own constructs. (33)

Without going in depth into what the above writer claims, the following sums up some of the theory, while showing how closely these differences in opinion of so long ago reflect the same issues of today. In the following Martin comments on the faults that Rosseau found with Plato's Book V and why he considers it necessary for a different type of education for women (Sophie) than for men.

> In the later [Republic], Plato abolishes the institutions of private marriage, home, family, and childbearing for the guardians of the Just State. There he also argues that sex is a difference that makes no difference in determining whether a person is suited by nature to rule, hence no difference in determining a person's education. Against Plato, Rosseau maintains that private marriage, home, family and childrearing are required by the ideal state and furthermore, that sex is a difference that makes

> all the difference. Rosseau, indeed, divides up everything according to sex, societal tasks, the knowledge and skill he considers essential to their performance, and the personal qualities and traits of character he associates with them (33/34) . . . We may reject Sophie and the sex-based division of labour in which her education is grounded but we have much to learn from Rousseau's reaction to Plato. For, unless women want to drop from their lives responsibility for societies reproductive process, they must acknowledge, as does Rosseau that the educational ideal Plato holds up for his guardians of both sexes is as incomplete as is the one Rosseau holds up for Emile. (Martin 35).

So how do we begin to re-introduce Sophie and Emile into the foundation of education? Some materials have been developed specifically for the education of teachers on the issues of gender. The Women's Educational Equity Act (WEEA) between 1976-1980 put together 233 products, 156 of which were, "intended for teacher education use" (M. Sadker and D. Sadker 1985a, 152). One fault is that most of these products are for the teacher who is already in the classroom, few for the pre-service teacher. "Consequently, they have been of limited use for the teacher educators who wish to train new teachers in skills requisite to the elimination of sex bias in the classroom" (52). The distribution of these products has been quite limited--mainly to teachers who already have a commitment to sex equity. "At the preservice level especially, it is very possible that the typical teacher educator is not even aware of the existence of these WEEA materials. WEEA has yet to penetrate the mainstream of teacher education" (52).

One development for preservice teachers by WEEA, however, was the Non-Sexist Teacher Education Project (NSTEP). The project was co-directed by the Sadkers at American University in Washington DC. The purpose of the project was to develop materials in the areas which had been found to be omitted from teacher education text books (154). These materials dealt with:

1) sexism in American education, it's history and it's impact, 2) women's access and contributions to education, 3) sex differences and similarities in achievement in all major subjects, grades, gifted and handicapped students and characteristics of personality, 4) bias in teacher expectations and patterns of interactions and ways to asses these issues in the classroom, 5) how to recognize instructional materials for stereotyping, imbalance, etc., 6) promotion of sex equity in school organizations (154).

The NSTEP curriculum was introduced at ten teacher education institutes in 1979-1980. An independent evaluation was done by Stake and Stake (1980) which consisted of attitude surveys, observations, and interviews. In logs of their reactions, ten times as many participants reported the material "relevant" as opposed to "non-relevant." Five times as many indicated the material to be "timely" as opposed to "out of date." Three-quarters gave an increased rating to the importance of sex equity as an important issue, and even more felt they had a better understanding of how teacher influence and continue the stereotyping of students. Also, over 50% of the participants said they had gained a "critical insight" from being exposed to the NSTEP materials. The following is one such critical incident.

> I read it cover to cover. I agreed with it. I wasn't aware of it, but so many times while I was reading it a light went on, and I said, "Yeah, yeah, that's what happens.' I wasn't looking for it, sexism, but now I'm aware of it, I heard it, and it was like a slap across the face. I heard it and it was just like a screech. I was very glad that I had the opportunity to read it [the module]. Next semester I'll be student-teaching and I know I'll have it as a top priority, something to conquer. (157)

So, it is obvious from the wealth of material presented above that quality pre-service activities can sensitize educators. The materials from the NSTEP project and other related teacher education projects can be found incorporated into the Sex Equity Handbook for Schools with it's accompanying Guide for Sex Equity Training. The two resources provide much information for both pre-service and in-service teachers.

If teachers are not given tools to be made aware of the sexism within society and schools, how are they to recognize the biases that they may themselves be promoting? Teachers have likely come out of a background and training which was biased. Therefore, "Teachers who send such signals to their students usually aren't aware of what they're doing" (AAUW 1992b, 9). However, they say that when gender bias is called to their attention and training to combat it is provided, "classroom behavior changes in ways that offer girls as much encouragement and feedback as boys. In short, girls start getting a better education" (10). In fact, the Sadkers claim that in giving sixty teachers four days of training they succeeded in eliminating bias resulting in "a higher level of intellectual discussion and . . . more effective and precise teacher responses to all students" (Sadker and Sadker 1985b, 57).

In concluding this chapter it seems that the following comments from MAT students make some of the strongest statements for the inclusion of gender issues in teacher education.

> "Yes--if there are tendencies that are discriminatory then this issue should be discussed. The socialization of boys and girls are very different at an early age and I imagine that this would be apparent in the classroom environment and thus, addressed. Maybe then, I would become aware of my own tendencies as a teacher and learner towards men and women."
> (MAT student male)

The second statement may prove the point even more strongly. In only the short time he took to think about and address the question, this student seems to change his whole awareness of the situation.

> "Yes, [gender bias should be addressed] but not as much as I think that such issues ought to be addressed on a societal level. Once prospective teachers are made aware of gender issues, this might have a rippling effect, based on the number of people with whom a teacher comes in contact. Perhaps it is better to begin small (teacher training programs) and move outward. Certainly, little is being done on a societal level now." (MAT student male)

It seems that few teachers or teachers in training would argue that sexism exists. If the conclusion that it therefore exists in school itself can be brought to their consciousness, that is, if all people would stop for a moment and give the issue the serious consideration that it deserves, then maybe all would come to the conclusion which this student did. Then, all educators could begin to learn how to help solve the problem instead of considering sexism an issue of the outside world.

CHAPTER 13

SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR PROMOTING SEX EQUITY IN THE CLASSROOM

> As an educator, you have the opportunity to nurture the Amelia Earhart in every girl, for it is there. Encourage girls to be assertive, brave, daring, athletic, intellectual, independent, creative and strong. Then they will be better able to deal with life as it is for women today. (Sadker and Sadker 1982, 32)

Once teachers are aware of the current situations which face the non-majority members of society they then have the ability to empower their students. Teachers can help strengthen students to "resist the continuous bombardments of messages they receive regarding sex, race, and class-appropriate roles, jobs and behaviors" (10).

A straight-forward and comprehensive list of things to do and avoid in class to promote gender equity can be found in Appendix A. A list of recommendations for integrating sex equity issues into teacher education programs by the Sadkers can be found in Appendix B. In addition here are some of the suggestions of the authors whose work has been looked at in this paper. Pearse (1989), states that some basic ways to begin are to examine and reflect on one's own educational experience. Because the majority of grade school teachers are women, "there is personal experience of the affects of expectations, institutional prejudice and stereotyping" (276). Secondly, she says "just look around." Begin to take notice of who makes up the teaching and non-teaching staff. Begin observing students interactions in class and outside of class. Start examining resources with sex bias in mind. Begin to make oneself aware of what the Sadkers call a "mind sex" whereby teachers tend to keep calling on students of the same sex. Though this happens with both sexes they found it to be more pronounced among boys (Sadker and Sadker 1985, 56). Think about how seating arrangements may cause this pattern to be more pronounced.

Girls Inc. out of Springfield, Massachusetts recently suggested the following for improving girls self-esteem:

- Provide opportunities for girls to explore other roles, experiences and activities that are generally reserved for boys.
- Enable every girl to be a media critic. Examine the way girls and women are portrayed on TV, in music, movies, books and magazines.
- Make sure girls get equal time in co-ed situations.
- Discourage tentative, questioning, approval-seeking approaches that girls are socialized to use.
- Avoid rescuing girls. Encourage girls to make an imperfect product, to get dirty, disheveled and sweaty in pursuit of a goal.
- Praise girls for their skills and successes. (cited in Norris 1993)

These are some of the ideas they list and though they designed to target girls, these suggestions can just as easily apply to women.

Some of the AAUW's suggestions to teachers are to encourage a variety of different types of work groups in class and observe what happens, what works best. They feel that while small-group work of mixed sexes has been thought of as a way to get both boys and girls working together, other research has found that "groups often provide boys with leadership opportunities that increase their self esteem. Females are often seen as followers and are less likely to want to work in mixed-sex groups in the future" (cited in AAUW 1992a, 73). While mixed-sex groups should not be discouraged, the teacher needs to remain aware of what is happening within the group.

The AAUW reports that science teachers who have been successful in encouraging girls in science were found to use the following strategies (cited in 1992a, 71): Using two or more textbooks (to balance a text that may be more biased towards boys), getting rid of sexist language, and holding equal expectations for both sexes.

In assessing a school's curriculum and thinking about curriculum change, the AAUW refers us to researcher Gretchen Wilbur (1991) who gives six attributes to look for in a curriculum which treats gender equitably.

> It acknowledges and affirms variation,i.e. similarities and differences among and within groups of people. It's inclusive, allowing both females and males to find and identify positively with messages about themselves. It's accurate, presenting information that is data based, verifiable and able to withstand critical analysis. It's affirmative, acknowledging and valuing the worth of individuals and groups. It's representative, balancing multiple perspectives. And finally it is integrated, weaving together the experiences, needs, and interests of both males and females. (cited in 1992a, 64)

The AAUW also considers the five phases Peggy McIntosh(1983) has identified. She feels these stages are ones which are true to both personal growth and curriculum change for becoming more open minded and diverse (cited in 1992a, 65). History is used to look at these phases.

> McIntosh describes Phase I as 'Womanless and All-White History.' Phases II is 'Exceptional Women and Persons of Color in History,' but only considered from the conventional perspective of, for instance, military, political or publicly acknowledged leaders. Phase III she terms the 'Issues' Curriculum, treating 'Women and People of Color as Problems, Anomalies, Absences, or Victims in History'. . . . In Phase IV we see, for the first time, the cyclical nature of daily life, the making and mending of the social fabric, which was projected onto 'lower-caste' people. Phase IV features lateral and plural thinking, sees 'vertical' thinking as simply one version of thinking, and encourages all students to 'make textbooks of their

> lives.' This phase, when interactively explored with other phases, makes possible the eventual reconstruction of Phase V, 'History Redefined and Reconstructed to Include Us All. (65)

Many schools today are still within the Phase I or II areas, particularly in the upper grades where "curriculum narrows and definitions of knowing take on gender-specific and culture specific qualities associated with Anglo-European male values" (65). Educators should begin looking at text and curricula to see where upon the spectrum they fall.

In English classes specifically, Bloom (1988) writes that because women's writings, particularly of the past, often did not conform to what many see as traditional writing, it is therefore important to begin looking at diaries, autobiographies, letters, travel narratives, etc. (13). "These genres expand and validate a wide range of experiences beyond the shores of the traditional white male mainstream" (13). There are plenty of women's voices; they are often just not found in the same places because women's access to these libraries was denied. Bloom's overall conclusion is to build flexibility and tolerance for modes of thinking, reading and writing beyond what has been considered the norm. All people live very different lives and can not and should not be expected to only work within a certain mode or style of thinking or writing. Yes, there need be standards and acceptable guidelines, but learn to listen and hear what is being said for its own special worth, not because it fits the template of what has been cut out by one group at one point in time.

Arun Mukherjee's words assist those who ponder how to improve the inclusiveness of the curriculum. Mukherjee writes about her experience of co-directing a course called "Concepts of Gender in the Western World" with a tenured male professor while she was on a limited contract.

> I knew I didn't have the same power, but still I used the opportunity to point out that there were no non-white writers in the curriculum. The senior member explained that that was because we were studying the 'West' and went on to say the West was not geographical, but Western culture which was Judeo-Christian culture. So I suggested we include some non-white texts as critiques of Judeo Christian culture and asked if I could teach a text about growing up black and female. The text I chose allowed me to deconstruct the underlying theory of the course. It posed questions: Whose experience is presented as women's? Which women are oppressors? Which women are oppressed? (1988, 23)

Mukherjee gives readers many things to think about. One, that even in an environment that may be hostile to new or threatening ideas there is always a way to present what one believes in. She demonstrates how learning becomes enhanced through the presentation of various view points and counter points. She also brings us further into issues of women's studies than the scope of this paper has been able to present, issues of class and race among women. "Even when you're locked in a corner, you can sow something: sow seeds of doubt--that is enough for adult learners. They'll go out and work for their own learning" (23).

CHAPTER 14

CONCLUSIONS

> Aggressiveness, for example, is judged by North Americans to be a desirable trait for males, but not for females (Beardsley 1977; Bloom et al., 1975). Likewise, a highly developed capacity for abstract reasoning, a self-control in which feeling and emotion are subordinated to the rule of reason, and an independent spirit--all these qualities for which men are praised and women are regarded with suspicion if not downright disdain. Yet these last are the very traits incorporated into the educational ideal Plato held up for his guardians, Rosseau holds up for Emile, and philosophers today hold up for both sexes. (Martin 1984, 37)

The above returns us to the original message: Males and females are brought up in different worlds. Through society, peers, teachers, texts, courses, books and authors, students are given very different messages making it more or less difficult to feel confident and able in speaking up. That the very traits which are so often de-programmed in females are the ones which students are expected and need to embody needs to be realized by all teachers. The abilities to question, argue, disagree and speak up which are so important to learning are seriously lacking in many female students.

> In acknowledging the difference of sex without making us prisoners of gender, a gender-sensitive ideal allows not only to continue the Platonic project of building into the education of females traits genderized in favor of males but also undertake the new and even more revolutionary project of building into everyone's education traits genderized in favor of females (Martin 1984, 38).

Again, this brings us back to the original paradox from which we started and gives readers a way of thinking about that paradox. We need to not only foster in girls those traits which are often seen as masculine, but also teach boys to embody those aspects seen as feminine and incorporate some of those feminine values into the base of education. For only when people are allowed to experience and understand a variety of ways of thinking and behaving are they ever going to reach their zenith.

It is my hope that this paper has succeeded on different levels for different people. For those who feel gender is not an issue in the classroom, it is my hope that I have succeeded in pointing out why it is. For those who already have an understanding and interest in the subject, I hope that they have come away with a broader perspective on what current work is saying and what further steps they can take. For those puzzled by why women do not always just speak up when they have the opportunity, I hope this question has been answered.

In trying to conclude why I chose to give the reader a broad perspective in issues of gender as opposed to going into greater detail the following thought arises. If school provided greater access to the current issues of gender, that is, if schools and education departments in particular gave issues of gender the service which they deserve, and which other departments have begun to give them, it would not have been necessary for this paper to try and cover all things at once. Knowing that for many this paper may be one of the first or only papers read on gender studies in education, I felt compelled to cover a great amount of territory. Regardless of the broad scope, I still feel that much was left out--issues of standardized tests and the tremendous bias which has been found in them are but one example.

Having the seeds of doubt sown within me by an education which questioned the status quo empowered me with the spirit to trust my feelings of inequity when they arise, the eyes to see inequity where it exists, and the endurance to continue chasing after the ideal, even during the times when no one else can be seen on the track. With this paper the question I had asked myself, "why can't I just speak up?" was, to a great extent, answered. To realize that one's perceived inadequacies of herself and her sex most often have a very long history of cultivation, and to be able to see where those seeds were planted and how they continue to grow is one of the major gifts which females should receive from education. It is a gift of power. In other words, knowing the source of oppressive forces is an initial stage of empowerment.

> Just five years ago I thought that if equal structural opportunity were made available to women they would--as a group and individually, rise to the challenge. I realized that the process of massive institutional change was a slow one, but I believed that the closed doors and discrimination (on both conscious and unconscious levels) were what held women back. More recently, however, I have come to give more weight to the subtle effects of the socialization process and the ways in which it handicaps women who are given 'equal opportunities' to 'compete like men'. (Weitzman 1984, 223)

APPENDIX A

The following list is from "Promoting Self- Esteem in Young Women" A Manual for Teachers.
The University of the State of New York
The State Education Department
Division of Civil Rights & Intercultural Relations
Albany, New York 12234

It is written in answer to the question "how can teachers begin the process of freeing the classroom of stereotyping, bias, and sexism which undermines self - esteem"? Pages 5-8. The guidelines were written for elementary and high school use, but pieces can be of use to all situations.

It would be well to start with some guidelines on the sorts of things to do:

1. Give everyone a chance to participate in class and encourage the participation of both girls and boys. Be aware of the fact that teachers tend to call on boys more often than girls.

2. Analyze your and expectations of the young men and young women in your classes, being careful that stereotyping and bias do not play a role. Since teacher expectations can function as "self-fulfilling prophecies," conscious and non-conscious attitudes can affect students' expectations of themselves.

3. Use praise to reinforce student accomplishments, being careful not to praise in stereotypical ways (e.g., "What a neat paper, Sue. Girls are so much neater than boys," might better be "Sue , I really appreciate the time you must have put into this paper.")
In praise, do two things, being careful that the praise is sincere and deserved:
   a. Praise the specific act, product, achievement, etc.
   b. Relate it to a more fundamental issue/belief about the self, especially when in it can counter a stereotype (e.g., "Lisa, your class presentation was especially clear and coherent. I've noticed you think very logically.")

4. Use constructive feedback as often as possible in helping develop the student's sense of competency and power. As with praise, countering the stereotypes is important (e.g., "Mary your math work this semester has improved greatly. Your remaining challenge can be dealt with by two or three sessions in the math lab which I will help you schedule. After that, I'm confident you can continue with additional math courses. Getting a solid math background is crucial to many career options.")

5. Enhance every student's chances of success, being sure that "success" is measured by small, day-to-day accomplishments, as well as "large" accomplishments. Bear in mind the old adage, "Nothing succeeds like success." Make classroom tasks do-able and interesting. Be sure the student knows you recognized his or her success.

6. Treat students as individuals responsible for what they do and for their achievements, rather than as members of a biological group (e.g. , "Jane, you should do will as a fashion designer. Women really do will in that field," would be better said, "you have developed a good sense of color and design, Jane. These skills will help you succeed in fashion design.")

7. Be a good listener and observer who recognizes the stereotypical and biased limitations being put on students. Counter these whenever possible.

8. Promote cause and effect thinking, that is, the recognition that consequences are attached to attitudes and behavior. Even when behavior is socially acceptable, the consequences are not always desirable (e.g., stress on a thin appearance, which is not physiologically possible for many females, often leads to health problems; failure to prepare oneself for a career that pays a living wage often leads to economic dependency or poverty.

9. Encourage both young women and young men to assume leadership positions.

10. Promote access to all academic and technical courses for both sexes. Help students see that sex segregation in courses and programs has nothing to do with ability.

11. Encourage girls and boys to explore and engage in activities traditionally associated with the opposite sex, rather than tolerating or reinforcing segregated activities (e.g. encourage young men to try out for cheerleading, encourage young women to run for class president).

12. Always take the attitude that what is done by girls is as important as what is done by boys (e.g. , girls' sports deserve the dame prominence and support as boys' sports).

There are additional guidelines of teaching behavior to avoid:

1. Avoid differentiated responses to boys and girls (e.g. , addressing the content and quality of a boy's essay, but the neatness and appearance of a girls' essay).

2. Avoid singling out a particular sex for certain chores or activities (e.g., "Will one of the boys carry this box to the office?" "Will one of the girls clean the blackboard?")

3. Avoid separating or grouping students on the basis of gender unless there is a compelling reason, such as privacy for bathrooms or locker rooms (e.g., girls against boys in a spelling bee, or girls in one line and boys in another is no more valid than dividing students on the basis of race, ethnicity or religion for those activities).

4. Avoid comparisons based on sex (e.g., "Good shot, Julie, you hit the ball just like a boy!" or "Get hold of yourself, Jim, you're acting like a girl!")

5. Do not tolerate stereotyping or sexist put-downs, jokes, or comments from students or adults.

6. Avoid ridicule, teasing, humor or sarcasm that is gender-based and stereotypical) e.g., "Primping all the time, Mary, that's just like a girl!" "John, you clumsy ox, you spilled my coffee!")

7. Avoid tearing down womanhood as a model (e.g., He was as weak as a woman." "He throws like a ball like a girl.")

8. Avoid behavior that assumes limitations in an individual based on her or his sex (e.g., the assumptions that young women are not good at auto mechanics or that boys can not cook, leading to excessive or inappropriate level of "help" that send messages about expected inadequacies. Offer support and encouragement but avoid "doing for."

9. Avoid display materials that convey negative or stereotyped messages.

10. Avoid recommending a career, or engaging in career counseling, based on sex-role stereotyping. Every student should be encouraged to explore all possible career options.

11. Avoid sex-stereotyped or sex-biased language (e.g., using "he" and "man" as generic for all humans. Studies show that "man" and "he" are heard as "male" as when a teacher talks about the "historical contributions of man".")

12. Be alert to stereotypical references to males and females in books and other teaching materials. If not possible to switch to sex-fair materials, point out the stereotypes and encourage students to discuss the issues.

13. Never criticize a student in front of others. Criticism should be offered in private and given in a constructive manner.

APPENDIX B

The following is a list from M. Sadker and D. Sadker's "The Treatment of Sex Equity in Teacher Education." In Susan Kline Ed. Handbook for Achieving Sex Equity Through Education. Pages 157-158. "The following are recommendations for integrating sex equity issues into teacher education programs so that teachers will attain knowledge and skills for effective instruction of both males and female students" (157).

Postsecondary Teacher Education Programs

Step 1: Self Evaluation. Review education policies and practices to insure that sex bias and discrimination are not part of ongoing teacher education activities. This institutional self-evaluation should include, but not be limited to, a review and plan to correct any sex bias found in

a. curricular materials, syllabi, and textbooks;
b. recruitment, employment, promotion, and tenure practices;
c. administrative and committee assignments;
d. brochures, policy statements, student-teacher evaluation forms, and so forth;
e. the enrollment of male and female students in graduate and undergraduate programs;
f. institutional compliance with the Title IX and other antidiscrimination laws and regulations.

Step 2: Remediation and Integration. Schools and departments of education should correct any forms of bias found as a result of these self-evaluations. This remediation can be accomplished through the establishment of revised policies and practices, the actions of standing committees, or the formation of special task forces or ad hoc committees. Selected objectives that should be addressed include

a. ensuring that information concerning Title IX and antidiscrimination legislation is disseminated to education faculty and students;
b. integrating sex equity information into the mainstream of teacher education courses and programs, including a knowledge of the history and contributions of women to education, studies of sex differences, strategies for identifying and revising sex bias in the K-12 curricular materials, and so forth;
c. providing inservice training to teacher educators to ensure that they are knowledgeable about and skilled in sex equity issues;
d. developing and implementing specialized courses dealing with sex equity and education and encouraging students to choose these topics for theses, dissertations, and research papers.

Step 3: Skills Training. Effective teacher education programs are marked by clinical components, Knowledge of effective instructional strategies must be translated into behaviors in order to be successful. Therefore, departments and schools of education should

a. revise methods of teaching, microteaching clinics, and other skills development courses to ensure the inclusion of sex-equitable teaching skills;
b. modify student teaching evaluation forms, seminars, and supervisory sessions to include sex equity concerns;
c. provide inservice training to teacher education faculty members to ensure that their own teaching demonstrates and models sex equity;
d. provide inservice training to inservice teachers and supervisors in local school districts to promote knowledge of and skills in sex equity.

Step 4: Research and Development. Aside from preparing and retraining teachers, schools and deparments of education should provide leadership in developing new frontiers of knowledge related to educational issues. To this end, teacher educators should encourage graduate-level research into the nature and impact of sex bias and sex discrimination, as well as rigorous assessments of the efficacy of proposed treatments.

WORKS CITED

Allocca, Rose and Rodney Muth. 1982, March. School Culture and Academic Achievement: A Cross- Gender Cross- Cultural Study. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association. New York N.Y.

American Association of University Women. 1992a "How Schools Shortchange Girls: A Study of Major Findings on Girls and Education." The AAUW Report--Wellesley College, MA. Center for Research on Women.

________. 1992b. "Shortchanging Girls, Shortchanging America: A Call to Action. AAUW Initiative for Educational Equality. Washington D.C.

________. 1992c. June. "Creating a Gender-Fair Multicultural Curriculum." Washington, D.C.

________. 1991 January. " Shortchanging Girls, Shortchanging America: A Nationwide Poll to Assess Self -Esteem, Educational Experiences, Interests in Math and Science and Career Aspirations of Girls and Boys Ages 9-15." Washington D.C.

Bloom, Lynn. 1988 March. Engendering Cultural Literacy . Paper presented at The annual meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication. 39th. St. Louis, MO.

Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis. 1976. Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life. Basic Books Inc. New York.

Bower, Bruce. 1991, March 23. "Teenage Turning Point: Does adolescence herald the twilight of girls' self-esteem?" Science News. v. 139.

Butler, Johnnella and Betty Schmitz. 1992, January/February. "Ethnic Studies, Women's Studies, and Multiculturalism." Change v.24 n.1 p.36 (6).

Crawford, Mary and Margo MacLeod. 1990. "Gender in the College Classroom; an Assessment of the "Chilly Climate for Women." Sex Roles: A Journal of Research v. 23, n.3.

Deming, Mary P. and Sheryl Gowen. 1990, June. Can We Get There From Here? The Intersection of Race, Gender and Class. Paper presented at The Young Rhetoricans Conference. Monterey CA. June 2-23.

Eisenhart, Margaret and Dorothy Holland. 1983. "Learning Gender from Peers: The Role of Peer Groups in the Cultural Transmission of Gender." Human Organization v. 42 n.4. p. 321-327

Elder, Donna and Stephen Parker. 1987. "The Cultural Production and Reproduction of Gender: The Effect of Extracurricular Activities on Peer-Group Culture." Sociology of Education. v. 60 200-213.

Goetz, Judith and Linda Grant. 1988, June. "Conceptual Approaches to Studying Gender in Education." Anthropology and Education Quarterly v. 19 182-96

Hartman, Mary S. 1990, July, 5. "Mills Students Provided Eloquent Testimony of the Value of Women's Colleges." The Chronicle of Higher Education. v. 36 n. 42 40a.

Hutchens, Rex and John Chilcott. 1989, March. "The Education of Cuban Women: An Analysis of the Politics of Gender." University of Arizona, Department of Anthropology. Tucson, Arizona.

Johnson, Dale. University of Wisconsin. 1973-1974. "Sex Differences in Reading Across Cultures." Reading Research Quarterly. n.1 p.67

Kaschak, Elly and Sara Sharratt. 1985, August 23-27. Gender Roles in Costa Rica: The Effect of the Presence of Males on Females. Paper presented at The annual convention of the American Psychological Association. (93rd, Los Angeles).

Keohane, Nannerl O. 1990. "Educating Women Students for the Future." In Antler and Biklen (Ed.) Changing Education: Women as Radicals and Conservators. State University of New York Press. p.3-13.

Languis, Marlin and Paul Naour. 1985, March 31-April 4. Sex Differences and Neurodevelopment Variables: A Vector Model. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. 69th Chicago Il.

Lather, Patty. 1981. "Reeducating Educators: Sex Equity in Teacher Education." Educational Horizons. v. 60 (1) 38-40.

Leo, John. 1990, June 11. "The Smart Case for Women's Schools." U.S. News and World Report. v.108 n.23 p.21.

Macaulay, Ronald K. S. 1978. "The Myth of Female Superiority in Language." Journal of Child Language. v.5 353-63.

Martin, Jane R. 1984. "Philosophy, Gender and Education." In Adker, Megarry, Nisbet and Hoyle (Ed.) World Yearbook of Education: Women and Education. Krogan Page London/Nichols Publishers, NY.

________. 1990. "The Contradiction of the Educated Woman." In Antler and Biklen (Ed.) Changing Education: Women as Radicals and Conservators. State University of New York Press. p.13-31

Mukherjee, Arun. 1988, November 26. "Challenging Racism" Speaking our Own Voice." Report of the Conference for Literacy Practitioners. Toronto, Ontario.

National Review, 1990, May 28. "Japan to the rescue," p. 39 and " The ladies of Mills" p. 17 v.42 n.10

Norris, Patty. 1993, January 15-16. "Gender bias evident in schools." Springfield Union News 1e-2e

Pearson, Judy C. 1985. Gender and Communication. Ohio University. William C. Brown Publishers. Dubuque, Iowa.

________. 1987 summer. "Interrelationships Between Gender and Communication." Center for Sex Equity. The Ohio State University College of Education. Instructional Materials Laboratory. Ohio Department of Education. v. 2 n.3.

Pearse, Sanchia. 1989. "Addressing Race and Gender in Rural Primary Schools Using Two Case Studies". Gender and Education. v.1 n.3 273-281.

Price, Gayle B. and Richard L. Graves. 1980 May. "Sex Differences in Syntax and Usage In Oral and Written Language." Research in the Teaching of English. v.14 n.2 147-153.

The University of the State of New York-The State Education Department. Division of Civil Rights and Intercultural Relations. "Promoting Self-Esteem in Young Women: A Manual for Teachers." Albany, NY 12234

Sadker, Myra and N. Frazier. 1973. Sexism in School and Society. Harper and Rowe New York.

Sadker, Myra and David Sadker. 1980. Beyond Pictures and Pronouns: Sexism in Teacher Education Textbooks. U.S. Department of Health Education and Welfare.

________. 1982. Sex Equity Handbook for Schools. Longman, New York

________. 1985a. "The Treatment of Sex Equity in Teacher Education." In Susan Kline (Ed.) Handbook for Achieving Sex Equity Through Education. The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Maryland.

________. 1985b, March. "Sexism in the Schoolroom of the 80's." Psychology Today 19 54-57

Scott-Jones, Diane and Maxime Clark. 1986, March. "The School Experience of Black Girls: The Interaction of Gender, Race and Socicoeconomic Status." Phi Delta Kappan. v. 67 520-526.

Shakeshaft, Carol. 1986, March. "A Gender at Risk." Phi Delta Kappan. v. 67 499.

Smith Daryl G. 1990. "Women's Colleges and Coed Colleges: is there a Difference for Women?" Journal of Higher Education. March-April v.61 n.2 p.181

Sommers, Christina. 1990. "Feminism and the College Curriculum." Imprimis Hillsdale College, MI. June 1990 V. 19 n.6. p. 1-4

Warren, Helen. 1988. The Absence of Women from the History of Rhetoric: Exclusion or Omission? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Communication Association. Baltimore, MD. April 27-May 1.

Weisfeld, Weisfeld, Warren and Freedman. 1983. "The Spelling Bee: A Naturalistic Study of Female Inhibition in Mixed-Sex Competition." Adolescence v. 18 n. 69-72 695-707.

Weitzman, Lenore J. 1984. "Sex Role Socialization: A Focus on Women." In Jo Freeman (Ed.) Women A Feminist Perspective. Mayfield Pub. Company. p. 157-238